DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 022 796

UD 001 395

By- Antonovsky, Aaron, Ed.; Lorwin, Lewis L., Ed.

DISCRIMINATION AND LOW INCOMES; SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC DISCRIMINATION AGAINST MINORITY GROUPS IN RELATION TO LOW INCOMES IN NEW YORK STATE.

New School for Social Research, New York, N.Y.; New York State Commission for Human Rights, N.Y.

Spons Agency-New York State Interdepartmental Committee on Low Incomes, Albany.

Pub Date 59

Note-379p.

EDRS Price MF-$1.50 HC-$15.24

Descriptors-CAUCASIAN STUDENTS, DEMOGRAPHY, *ECONOMIC DISADVANTAGEMENT, ECONOMIC STATUS, EMPLOYER ATTITUDES, EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES, *EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES, HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS, INVESTIGATIONS, *LOW INCOME, *MINORITY GROUPS, NEGROES, OCCUPATIONS, PUERTO RICANS, SOCIAL DISADVANTAGEMENT, *SOCIAL DISCRIMINATION, SUBURBS, TABLES (DATA), URBAN AREAS, VOCATIONAL INTERESTS

Identifiers-Elmira, New York State, New York State Commission Against Discrimination

This study under the direction of the N.Y. State Commission Against Discrimination (SCAD) investigated the relationship of low incomes to social and economic discrimination against Negroes and Puerto Ricans in New York State. The scope of the study included analyses by various authors of the present economic status of Negroes and Puerto Ricans, the limitations of their earning capacities and income, and developments most likely to affect their future employment opportunities. For the purpose of this study $2,000.00 annual family income was assumed to be the poverty line. The document includes recommendations drawn from the implications of the studies, basic facts about the economic status of New York's minority groups, illustrations by specific cases, and a theoretical summation of the social meaning of discrimination. A 54 page appendix follows which includes tables and questionnaires used in collecting the data. (RG)

State of New York

Nelson A. Rockefeller
Governor

INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE ON LOW INCOMES

During 1956-1958 the New York State Interdepartmental Committee on Low Incomes engaged in investigations of the current distribution of incomes in New York State and factors which affect incomes and levels of living. Staff studies were undertaken to assess the magnitude of the low income problem in the State and to discover why many families and individuals do not share adequately in the continuing improvement of the American standard of living. A pilot program was launched to demonstrate how available resources -- public and private -- can be utilized effectively to help low income people achieve higher levels of productivity and self-support, and fuller participation in the social and economic life of the community. Defined objectives were to prevent the occurrence of low incomes, break the self-perpetuating cycle of poverty, and improve the capacity of local communities to provide employment for all available human resources.

The sponsoring interdepartmental committee appointed by Governor Harriman consisted of Isador Lubin, Industrial Commissioner, as Chairman, and Daniel J. Carey, Commissioner of Agriculture and Markets; James E. Allen, Jr., Commissioner of Education; Herman E. Hilleboe, M.D., Commissioner of Health; Paul H. Hoch, M.D., Commissioner of Mental Hygiene; Raymond W. Houston, Commissioner of Social Welfare; Edward T. Dickinson, Commissioner of Commerce; Joseph P. McMurray, Commissioner of Housing; Charles Abrams, Chairman, State Commission Against Discrimination; Mark A. McCloskey, Chairman, Youth Commission; Persia Campbell, Consumer Counsel to the Governor; Philip M. Kaiser, Special Assistant on Problems of the Aging, Executive Department; and Angela Parisi, Chairman, Workmen's Compensation Board.

The Committee's staff consisted of Meredith B. Givens, Executive Director, Eleanor M. Snyder, Gladys F. Webbink, John G. Meyers, Nora K. Piore, and Iwan S. Koropeckyj.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

[illegible] University

DISCRIMINATION AND LOW INCOMES

Social and Economic Discrimination Against Minority Groups in Relation to Low Incomes in New York State

Studies under the direction of the
NEW YORK STATE COMMISSION ~~AGAINST DISCRIMINATION~~ For Human Rights
by the
NEW SCHOOL FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH

Edited by

Aaron Antonovsky, Director of Research
New York State Commission Against Discrimination
and
Lewis L. Lorwin, Research Division
New School for Social Research

1959

One of a series of related investigations supported by the New York State Interdepartmental Committee on Low Incomes and undertaken by cooperating agencies and universities in the State

State of New York
INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE ON LOW INCOMES

UD 001 395

INFORMATION RETRIEVAL CENTER ON THE DISADVANTAGED
Ferkauf Graduate School of Education, Yeshiva University

STATE OF NEW YORK

STATE COMMISSION AGAINST DISCRIMINATION

GEORGE H. FOWLER
~~Elmer A. Carter~~
Chairman

J. Edward Conway Commissioner	Bernard Katzen Vice-Chairman Commissioner
Ruperto Ruiz ~~John A. Davis~~ Commissioner	Bessie A. Buchanan ~~Mary Louise Nice~~ Commissioner
Lloyd L. Hurst, commissioner	Francis X. Giaccone, commissioner

Charles Livermore	Executive Secretary
Henry Spitz	General Counsel
John B. Sullivan	Director of Education
Milton Rosenberg	Director of Employment
Edward Rutledge	Director of Housing
Philip Partnow	Director of Investigations
Aaron Antonovsky	Director of Research

ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR THE STUDY

Charles Abrams - Former Chairman, State Commission Against Discrimination
Josephine Cunningham - Research Division, State Commission Against Discrimination
John A. Davis - Associate Professor of Government, College of the City of New York and Commissioner, State Commission Against Discrimination
Meredith B. Givens - Executive Director, New York State Interdepartmental Committee on Low Incomes
Charles Livermore - Executive Secretary, State Commission Against Discrimination
Morton J. Schussheim - Director of Research, New York Temporary State Housing Rent Commission
John B. Sullivan - Director of Education, State Commission Against Discrimination
Arthur L. Swift, Jr. - Dean, School of Politics, New School for Social Research

INFORMATION RETRIEVAL CENTER ON THE DISADVANTAGE
Ferkauf Graduate School of Education, Yeshiva Univers

CONTENTS

Pages

CONTRIBUTORS vii

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ix

Chapters

I - THE DISCRIMINATION AND LOW INCOMES PROJECT- Lewis L. Lorwin 1

Part One - Recommendations

II - IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDIES - Charles Abrams 15

Part Two - Basic Facts

III - MINORITY GROUPS AND ECONOMIC STATUS IN NEW YORK STATE - Gladys Engel Lang 49

IV - SIGNIFICANT TRENDS IN THE NEW YORK STATE ECONOMY: With Special Reference to Minority Groups - Vera R. Russell 71

Part Three - Cases in Point

V - NEGRO AND WHITE YOUTH IN ELMIRA - Aaron Antonovsky and Melvin J. Lerner 103

VI - MANAGEMENT AND MINORITY GROUPS: A Study of Attitudes and Practices in Hiring and Upgrading - Bernard Rosenberg and Penney Chapin 147

VII - DISCRIMINATION IN THE HIRING HALL: A Case Study of Pressures to Promote Integration in New York's Brewery Industry - Gladys Engel Lang 195

CONTENTS

Chapters **Pages**

Part Three (cont.)

VIII - PUERTO RICAN INTEGRATION IN THE SKIRT INDUSTRY IN NEW YORK CITY - Roy B. Helfgott 249

IX - PROGRESS TOWARD INTEGRATION: Four Case Studies - Sally Backer and Harry C. Harris 281

Part Four - A Theoretic Summation

X - THE SOCIAL MEANING OF DISCRIMINATION - Aaron Antonovsky 307

Appendices

A - Minority Groups and Economic Status in New York State: Working Tables for Chapter III 327

B - The Elmira Study: Questionnaire 361

C - The Management Study: Questionnaire 367

D - A Classification of Discriminatory Employment Practices 369

E - Suggested Areas and Topics for Additional Research on Discrimination and Low Incomes 373

F - Participants in the Advisory Conference, March 9, 1957 381

21/54

CONTRIBUTORS

Charles Abrams	Chairman, New York State Commission Against Discrimination*
Aaron Antonovsky	Director of Research, New York State Commission Against Discrimination
Sally Backer	Research Division, New York State Commission Against Discrimination*
Penny Chapin	Research Division, Market Psychology Inc.
Harry C. Harris	New York State Commission Against Discrimination
Roy B. Helfgott	Research Director, Cloak Joint Board, International Ladies Garment Workers Union,* Assistant Professor of Economics, Pennsylvania State College
Gladys Engel Lang	Research Division of the New School for Social Research,* Lecturer in Sociology, Brooklyn College
Melvin J. Lerner	Assistant Professor of Sociology and Psychology, Elmira College,* Russell Sage Resident, School of Education, Stanford University
Lewis L. Lorwin	Research Division, New School for Social Research
Bernard Rosenberg	Research Director, Market Psychology Inc.,* Assistant Professor of Sociology, College of the City of New York
Vera R. Russell	Economist, New York State Department of Commerce

*Positions held at the time of the study

Discrimination and Low Incomes may be obtained from the New York State Commission Against Discrimination, 270 Broadway, New York 7, N. Y.

Any section of the book may be used or reproduced provided appropriate credit is given to the authors and publishers.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many persons and organizations have assisted in the planning and preparation of the studies in this volume. It is a pleasure to acknowledge in particular the encouragement given by Isador Lubin, former Industrial Commissioner of the State of New York. The assistance of the SCAD Commerce and Industry Advisory Committee was most helpful in facilitating interviews with corporations. Without the cooperation of the Mayor's Committee on Human Relations of Elmira at all stages of the research relating to that community, the study would not have been possible. The cooperation of Paul M. Densen, Director of Research, Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York, in making available data from its 1952 study of Health and Medical Care, and of the New York State Department of Labor, contributed to the strength of Part Two, Basic Facts.

We are likewise appreciative of the research assistance of Arno Winard on a number of these studies, and of the constructive comments by members of the staff of the State Commission Against Discrimination and of other State departments in connection with one or another of the studies.

The ideas and suggestions of the working conference of specialists in the field held on March 9, 1957 were invaluable in the completion of the studies. A list of conference participants is to be found in Appendix F.

We are most grateful to Hermine Popper for her preparation of the manuscript for publication.

Aaron Antonovsky
Lewis L. Lorwin

Chapter I

THE DISCRIMINATION AND LOW INCOMES PROJECT

Lewis L. Lorwin

The studies presented in this volume are concerned with the relationship of social and economic discrimination to low incomes among Negroes and Puerto Ricans in New York State. That these two groups are discriminated against in their economic activities and in their social relations is not open to dispute. It is also undisputed that there is a relatively large concentration of these groups in the low income brackets and a proportionately high incidence of depressed living conditions among them. What is not as clearly defined is the extent of the relationship and its implications. This volume is primarily an effort to explore some areas in which these relationships and implications can be exposed more clearly.

Two reasons prevailed for undertaking these studies at this time. The first was the appeal of Governor Averell Harriman, soon after his inauguration, for a greater concern with the problem of "poverty amidst prosperity" in New York State. The second was the belief of the State Commission Against Discrimination (hereafter referred to as SCAD) that the problem of low incomes could not be solved without an understanding of the nature and impact of discrimination upon it.

THE BACKGROUND

The Problem of Poverty

During the quarter century before World War I the prevalence of poverty was one of the main concerns of Western countries. The leading economist of the period, Alfred Marshall, declared that poverty was society's most important problem and the main justification for the study of economics. Economists and sociologists in Great Britain and the

United States sought to explore the meaning and extent of poverty, to determine its causes, and to devise methods for its elimination or reduction.

During the early 1920s there was a shift of interest to problems of wages and unemployment. This was a logical development of the thinking of earlier investigators who had emphasized irregular employment and chronic unemployment as among the main factors of poverty (another being the large sizes of families).

After 1923, however, the idea took hold that America had entered a "new economic era" of high wages and economic stability. In the sanguine spirit of the times, interest in conditions of poverty waned, despite realities which contradicted that spirit.

The depression decade from 1929 to the outbreak of World War II veered interest from relative poverty to mass unemployment and economic collapse. The phrase "poverty amidst plenty," and Franklin D. Roosevelt's declaration that one-third of the nation was ill-fed, ill-clothed, and ill-housed, dramatized prevailing social-economic problems, and the need for major economic and social reforms.

Attitudes began to shift again after 1945 when prosperity, including both high profits and rising wages, and the benefits of the social security system re-created a great faith in the American economy. Economic expansion, world economic development, and the challenge of inflation came to the economic forefront. Full employment and higher living standards fed a growing belief that there was not only no justification for poverty but that it did not in fact exist. The less fortunate were considered largely victims of conditions within the province of social work and public assistance.

New Investigations and Questions

A closer look at economic conditions, however, has raised new doubts as to whether such complacency is justified. The reports of the Congressional Joint Committee on the Economic Report have made it clear that many Americans have incomes inadequate for a minimum level of living. The Subcommittee on Low-Income Families of the Congressional Joint Committee has fixed a $2000 annual family income as such a minimum. In 1955 more than 7 million families in the United States were estimated to be at or below this deviding line.[1] In New York State 800,000 families and 595,000 individuals fell within that category. These figures raise questions of whether such families were in a state of poverty and of why such a condition should persist in a period of full employment and high prosperity.[2]

---

[1] A report of the Census Bureau confirms this estimate also for the year 1956. See New York Times, September 10, 1957.

Governor Harriman's Action

Against this background Governor Averell Harriman, in a message to the New York State Legislature in January 1956, called for an "attack on poverty." The state legislature appropriated an initial $100,000 for proposed studies, and Governor Harriman appointed an Interdepartmental Committee on Low Incomes to make broad inquiries into the incidence and causes of low incomes and depressed living conditions in the state. Existing state programs were to be evaluated and new studies undertaken which would point to practical programs for grappling with the problem. The Interdepartmental Committee, headed by Industrial Commissioner Isador Lubin, set up a special staff for the purpose, under the direction of Dr. Meredith B. Givens. The studies included in this volume have been carried out as part of this committee's general program.

Recognition of the Special Problem of Minority Groups

The Congressional Joint Committee has pointed to the proportionately large concentration of nonwhites in low-income groups shown in studies of the Census Bureau and the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Governor Harriman's message referred to preliminary studies which showed that the highest incidence of low-income families in New York City and adjacent suburban counties was among nonwhites.

The need for an analysis of the factors responsible for the greater concentration of low-income families among minority groups -- particularly, in New York, the Negro and Puerto Rican minority -- was thus recognized by the Interdepartmental Committee on Low Incomes. In outlining the scope of its inquiry, the committee stated that its purpose was to determine the extent and distribution of low incomes in the state, the patterns of living which accompany low earnings, the characteristics of those families that are chronically or permanently in low-income brackets, and the degree to which low earnings are associated with personal, industrial, ethnic, environmental, and social factors. The ethnic factors to be studied include the economic and social discrimination facing these minority groups.

---

[2] An informative discussion of the income distribution and of the continued "hard core of genuine poverty" in the United States may be found in the Papers and Proceedings of the Sixty-ninth meeting of the American Economic Association held in Cleveland, Ohio, December 27-29, 1956.

SCAD's Interest in the Problem

This special problem was of obvious interest to SCAD, which functions under a law that declares that "practices of discrimination against any of its inhabitants because of race, creed, color or national origin are a matter of State concern, that such discrimination threatens not only the institutions and foundations of its inhabitants but menaces the institutions and foundations of a free democratic state." The law charges the Commission "to eliminate and prevent discrimination in employment, in places of public accommodation, resort or amusement, and in publicly-assisted housing accommodations because of race, creed, color or national origin."

SCAD's function under the law includes the undertaking of studies and research to deal also with discrimination in the "terms and conditions of employment." The Commission, represented by its Chairman, Charles Abrams, felt that a study of discrimination in relation to incomes could provide guides for dealing with the problems involved in advancing the purposes of the state's anti-discrimination legislation. Although SCAD's concern is with discrimination against all groups, it felt justified in concentrating this study on the problems of Negroes and Puerto Ricans since they were the predominant victims of discrimination in the state.

After some negotiations it was agreed to transmit $10,000 to SCAD out of the first year's legislative appropriation for the study of the relationship between discrimination and low incomes. The Interdepartmental Committee maintained a continuing interest and advisory function, but SCAD bears general responsibility for the form and content of the studies, and each author is responsible for the specific structure and interpretations presented.

The New School's Role

As SCAD had limited research facilities at the time these studies were undertaken, the Commission asked the New School for Social Research to carry out the proposed research. In the fall of 1956 preliminary plans for a research project were drawn up.[3] In January 1957, after the proposed studies were approved by Industrial Commissioner Isador Lubin, SCAD contracted with the New School for the conduct of the studies. On the recommendation of SCAD the New School appointed Dr. Aaron Antonovsky as project director. Dr. Gladys Engel Lang joined the staff as research associate in January, and Mr. Arno Winard came on as statistical and research assistant in March. Dr. Melvin J. Lerner became field director of the study in Elmira. Dr. Roy B. Helfgott, Mrs. Vera R. Russell, and Market Psychology, Inc., were commissioned by the New School to make their respective studies. An advisory committee was set up consisting of Commissioner Charles Abrams, Miss Josephine Cunningham, Dr. John A. Davis, Dr. Meredith B. Givens, Mr. Charles Livermore, Dr. Morton J. Schussheim, Mr. John B. Sullivan, and Dr. Arthur L. Swift, Jr.[4]

In the course of the project it was thought desirable to consult with specialists in the field to sound out current thinking on problems of discrimination and on research methods and procedures. A working conference was therefore called at the New School on March 9, 1957. Ideas and suggestions growing out of these meetings were invaluable to the completion of the studies. Early drafts of the studies were further submitted to a number of experts whose helpful comments and suggestions were incorporated into the final revised papers.

THE STUDY

Plan for the Project

Considering the small sum available, the committee deemed it impractical to attempt to seek definitive answers. It was decided to open a selected number of areas, gathering data which would indicate lines for further research and action. The fact that this project was part of an over-all low-incomes study was steadily kept in mind, but the frame of reference was conceived broadly. It was thought desirable to undertake studies dealing with several basic questions in the field of discrimination. The underlying assumption was that where discrimination operates to bar or limit the mobility of minority group members -- either through presenting direct barriers to their progress or through crippling their capacities -- the problem was relevant to their disproportionate concentration in low-income brackets. If we could pinpoint and analyze some discriminatory mechanisms and at the same time some factors promoting integration, we could contribute to further understanding of the over-all problem of low incomes and of the part played by discrimination.

---

[3] An early outline of possible research questions prepared by Clarence and Sylvia Sherwood is reprinted in this volume as Appendix E.

[4] For professional affiliations of members of the committee, see p. iii. Participants in the March 9 conference are listed in Appendix F.

Wherever possible the individual studies were developed in conjunction with the current work of SCAD. Thus one of the studies was conducted jointly with the Elmira Mayor's Committee on Human Relations; another study was undertaken in cooperation with the SCAD Commerce and Industry Advisory Committee; and a third was based on data growing out of a lengthy series of investigations and complaints handled by SCAD.

The Scope of the Study

The final plan for the project included four points of inquiry:

1. The present economic status of Negroes and Puerto Ricans in New York State. This was not meant to imply that discrimination was exercised only against these groups, but rather that with no other groups in New York does discrimination so seriously affect economic status.

2. The major discriminatory mechanisms which limit minority group participation in the social and economic life of the state.

3. The ways in which discriminatory practices affect the earning capacities and income levels of minorities.

4. Economic developments which are likely to affect the employment opportunities in the near future.

Desirability of Definitions

The $2000 annual family income could be assumed as the poverty line for the purpose of the study. From SCAD's viewpoint the main issue was the disproportionate incidence of low incomes among minority groups which might be imputed to discrimination, and not where the lines of low incomes and poverty were drawn. However, for purposes of evaluating the economic disadvantages of Negroes and Puerto Ricans in New York State it was desirable to establish some basis of comparison.

Guiding Ideas

The studies were guided by three ideas:

1. Low incomes and poverty are not synonymous.

2. The term poverty must be used to cover a total cultural situation.

The early British economists had a severe concept of minimum economic and social requirements, in accordance with the social outlook of their day. They defined poverty as a lack of sufficient income to maintain a family of normal size in a state of physical efficiency. Some drew a distinction between primary poverty due to lack of sufficient income and secondary poverty due to spending money on indulgences rather than on necessities, or to poor family budgeting. The impoverished family of a habitual drunkard would fall into this second class.

This early concept is obsolete today. In contemporary American society low incomes and poverty do not refer to a bare level of physical subsistence, but to insufficient purchasing power to maintain a socially acceptable minimum standard of living, including adequate diet, a home with sufficient living space and modern plumbing, and proper medical care. This concept of a "minimal welfare level" has gained ground in the United States in the past two decades as part of the "American Creed."

3. While the subjective element in low incomes and poverty is recognized, their objective character can be expressed in budgetary terms.

Defining Poverty

These studies use budget estimates of the Interdepartmental

Committee,[5] based on figures of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics[6] and of the Budget Standard Service of the Welfare and Health Council of New York City (renamed in 1956 The Community Council of Greater New York, Inc.).[7] The income estimates for a family of four in New York City and other urban areas of New York State are:

1. Minimum living income: $3000 to $3500.
2. Low income: $2000 to $3000.
3. At or below the poverty line: $2000 a year or less.

The last estimate conforms to that of the Congressional Joint Committee.[8]

The validity of these dividing lines has been questioned by some investigators who maintain that a $2000 annual family income does not necessarily mean poverty or deprivation for all families in that income category. They argue that poverty is a relationship between family income and family needs, which vary from case to case, and that no precise measure can be valid.[9]

This question is clarified in Governor Averell Harriman's special message to the New York Legislature on January 30, 1957:

---

[5] Daniel Creamer, The Determination of the Low Income Yardstick for New York in 1949, unpublished paper prepared for the Interdepartmental Committee on Low Incomes, 1957.

[6] Bureau of Labor Statistics (Bulletin No. 927, 1948), Workers Budgets in the U.S.: City Families and Single Persons, 1946 and 1947.

[7] Welfare and Health Council of New York City, Research Department, A Family Budget Standard, 1955.

[8] Congress of the United States, 84th Congress, First Session, Washington, D.C. (1955), Hearings before the Subcommittee on Low-Income Families of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

[9] First National Bank of New York, Monthly Letter, Nov.-Dec., 1956.

> This figure of $2000 is, of course, not a precise dividing line between an adequate and inadequate family income. We all know that poverty and low incomes are not synonymous. To determine what families are living below minimum basic standards we must consider not only what the family earns but what the family needs. Some family incomes below $2000 may be sufficient for basic needs; some such families own their own homes and are using capital resources such as savings to support an adequate standard of living despite their low current income. Others may experience low incomes only temporarily. For still others, low income is the beginning in a life cycle of earnings which may be expected to rise.
>
> Our principal concern is with those individuals and families who for sustained periods live at levels below what the community may reasonably consider as adequate. These may include some families with higher incomes who nevertheless do not have sufficient means to meet the cost of basic needs, such as unusually large families or households with incapacitated members.

It is in this context that the economic position of Negroes and Puerto Ricans in New York is examined. Some low-income members of these groups may find that their living conditions today are better than in past years or other places, but their marginal status continues to pose problems both for themselves and society.

Families are considered at the poverty level when the impact of low incomes is aggravated by one or more of the following conditions: large number of children or other dependents; irregular employment; prolonged periods of unemployment; loss of breadwinner by death, disability, or old age; illness; or broken home.[10] Available data indicate that such conditions are most widespread among minority groups, making them most vulnerable to the threat of poverty.

It has been said that in a competitive society such as ours inequalities in job opportunities and in earnings reflect primarily differences in native abilities. Under this theory, the concentration of minority groups in low-income brackets is presumed to be proof of their inadequacies.

---

[10] National Social Welfare Assembly, Making Both Ends Meet on Less Than $2000 A Year, a communication to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report from the Conference Group of Nine National Voluntary Organizations Convened in Washington, D. C., 1951, pp. 1-23.

The theory has been invalidated on many grounds. Scientists have proved the biological equality of men of all races and creeds; sociologists have shown that achievement is a result of many social factors such as education, training opportunities, and home environment; economists have demonstrated that the labor market does not work smoothly in utilizing individual capacities. An explanation of the lower economic status of minority groups must thus be sought along other lines. Whatever conditions make for low incomes generally, for minority groups the additional factor of discrimination is involved.

The Structure of Discrimination

In the studies presented here, discrimination embraces the continuing economic and social restrictions because of race, religion, or cultural background which limit possibilities for advancement. While discrimination may be expressed in individual acts, such acts are rooted in prevalent traditions, stereotyped images, and social arrangements. Discriminatory practices tend to fall into patterns and to be embodied into the institutional framework of society and thus to operate in the manner of impersonal pressures and compulsions. Discrimination is not always accompanied by a feeling of conscious prejudice. It may be practiced for reasons of fear or gain or because of passive acceptance of socially sanctioned ways of doing things.

Any concrete act of discrimination is the result of mixed motives, attitudes, and forms of behavior. Table 1a suggests possible relationships among psychological, economic, and social factors of discrimination.

Discrimination is related to low income when its effect on minority groups is to limit their competitive position in the labor market. It affects the individual at crucial stages of his development, such as in educational and vocational preparation, freedom of choosing a home, and opportunities for employment and advancement. These limitations on the individual's mobility distort the supply and demand of labor in ways prejudicial to the bargaining power and earning potential of minorities (see Appendix D).

The Organization of the Study

The considerations and limitations sketched here have determined the final choice of topics of this volume. In Part I the Chairman of SCAD has developed the ideas underlying SCAD's approach to the problem of discrimination and formulated a series of recommendations for action

Table 1a. The Structure of Discrimination

Motivations	Attitudes	Forms and Methods
Desire to assert personal superiority	Conscious prejudice	Racial stereotypes perpetuated by individuals and groups
Claim to higher social status	Conscious prejudice	Racial distinctions built into educational and other social institutions
Competitive advantage	Fear of economic insecurity; conscious or unconscious prejudice	Restrictive devices in vocational training and employment
Profit making	Conscious or unconscious prejudice	Formal and informal restrictive policies in hiring and upgrading
Protecting property and investments	Fear of losses; conscious prejudice	Restrictive policies in housing, etc.
Social conservatism	Opposition to social change; conscious prejudice	Community regulations to maintain status quo in racial relations

which flow from the ideas and data developed throughout the research project. The two chapters of Part II present the facts relevant to a study of discrimination and low incomes. First, available economic data on the status of Negroes and Puerto Ricans in New York are brought together and examined for evidence of the extent of concentration of these groups in low-paid occupations and low-income brackets. Second, the significant trends in the economy of New York which work to hinder or improve equality of economic opportunity are traced. This chapter is a concrete inquiry into the dynamics of discrimination as affected by industrial changes, economic expansion, and shifts in the demand for labor. These two chapters document present differentials in employment status and incomes of minority groups, and also point out where new opportunities may develop. They strongly suggest that such opportunities will depend on several factors -- motivation and aspirations of minority groups, facilities for training, management and labor policies, and community attitudes. The problems raised by these prerequisites are examined in Part III.

Part III contains the reports of the field surveys and case studies. The Elmira study explores the forces which affect the acquisition of skills and the development of competitive potential among minority youth. The survey of management attitudes toward hiring and upgrading describes some of the barriers impeding the economic advancement of minorities and probes into their social and psychological causes. The studies of Negroes in the New York brewery industry and of Puerto Ricans in the garment trades deal with efforts to eliminate discriminatory employment practices and to integrate minority groups into specific industries and into the labor organizations dominant in these industries. A fifth field study is based on case studies of "success stories" -- in which a non-discriminatory policy was effectively developed in corporations.

Finally, in Part IV the project director attempts to elucidate the social meaning and forms of discrimination and the nature of their impact on economic opportunities of minority groups in general. The chapter may be described as an essay in the sociology of discrimination.

While the studies deal with a specific question and specific situations, they have a larger significance insofar as they are unified by a central theme and a common point of view. The theme, in its broad aspects, is the fulfillment of the promise of equal opportunity in a free society. The point of view is that discrimination, operating through social and economic mechanisms, negates this basic principle of American life, with consequences detrimental not only to the groups discriminated against but to society as a whole.

Those responsible for this volume are fully aware of its limitations -- that it raises some questions which are not answered and leaves unfilled gaps in factual data and analysis. We believe, however, that these pilot studies (for that is what they are) are of public interest. The over-all body of data and ideas contained here constitutes one of the first important attempts to understand the relationship between discrimination and income. The material and analysis presented here indicate lines along which a long-range program of research may be formulated by SCAD to guide remedial action in regard both to low incomes and to economic and social discrimination.

Part One

RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter II

IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDIES

Charles Abrams

One of the more significant implications yielded by the studies that follow is the dearth of information on the relationship between low incomes and discrimination. The field has been so devoid of essential data that the hypotheses upon which vital research could be formulated do not yet exist. This is particularly true of data involving the Puerto Rican migration.

When, therefore, Governor Harriman authorized the Commission to undertake some initial studies in the area with a small allotment of funds from the low-income appropriation, the Commission decided that the most effective use of the fund allotted could be made by exploring several limited areas of research. Simultaneously the Commission undertook a general exploratory analysis of existing data, supplemented by interviews with informed people in housing, employment, labor relations, religion, social work, education, and government.

The first effort is represented by the papers in this volume. The second study,[1] to which occasional references are made in the chapter that follows, deals with the more general aspects of the problem in up-state metropolitan areas of New York. These two studies, supplemented by the functional experience gained by the Commission through the more than 5,000 complaints it has processed since 1945, and amplified by the data to be forthcoming from the companion studies of the Interdepartmental Committee on Low Incomes, should represent the beginning of a pool of information on the important problem of low incomes in New York State and afford at least a preliminary view into the part which discrimination plays in it.

---

[1] Eunice and George Grier, Negroes In Five New York Cities, New York State Commission Against Discrimination, August 1958. This study was initiated through a grant from the J. M. Kaplan Foundation.

I. THE DEMOGRAPHIC BACKGROUND

The last four decades have witnessed a major change in the composition of the nation's northern population. Curtailment of foreign immigration in the 1920s, coupled with an economic activity spurred by war and an expanding economy, saw Negroes leaving the South in ever-increasing numbers.

New York State became a main focus of their concentration and 958,097 or roughly 6 percent of all the nation's nonwhites -- some 95 percent of them Negro -- had moved to the state by 1950. By 1957 this number had spurted to an estimated 1,260,000. These migrants settled largely in the urban areas and composed about 7.7 percent of the state's total population. While metropolitan New York housed 87 percent of them, upper New York State experienced an increase from 36,000 nonwhites in 1940 to 108,000 in 1950 and to 166,000 by 1957 (Ch. IV).[2]

This rise of the nonwhite population was accompanied after 1940 by another major migration from Puerto Rico. Prior to 1940 emigration from the island had averaged only a few thousand persons a year. By 1950 more than 226,000 persons born in Puerto Rico had moved to the mainland, 85 percent of whom lived in New York State. About 600,000 persons of Puerto Rican extraction now reside here, of whom 75 percent were born on the island. A net in-migration of 32,000 persons is anticipated annually for the next three to five years, and by 1970 the Puerto Rican population is expected to be augmented through migration and natural increase by an additional 600,000 persons (Ch. VIII). The Puerto Rican population of New York State is roughly equal to a quarter of the population now living in Puerto Rico.

---

[2] All references indicated in this manner refer to the studies in this volume.

II. THEORIES OF POVERTY AND DISCRIMINATION

These migrations had characteristics in some respects similar to but in many respects different from previous migrations. Though a considerable amount of literature exists on the new migrations, vital information is missing on the effects of current discriminatory practices on economic status and prospects, and on the supply of and demand for labor. A great deal has been written about poverty and a great deal about discrimination, but almost nothing about the interrelationship between the two.

Three main theories seemed to have gained credence among those who have grappled with the problem in the past. One may be expressed as follows: The most recent newcomers are simply another pool of competitors for the better life. The same sequence of struggle, advance and ultimate assimilation must follow in their case as with migrants before them. Prejudice has always existed against new arrivals--whether Jew, Catholic, Russian, or Italian--and it has exhausted itself in harmless episodes. An ultimate rapprochement will be achieved with the latest newcomers as well.

Even some of the more recent studies of the problem lean toward this view of the preordained breakthrough. One theory holds that each immigrant group will follow the pattern of movement from the lowest point in the social and economic pyramid to a higher place -- "most if not all of them will ultimately disappear from American life." Other authorities have felt that with the development of Negro industrial and professional classes, the distinction between the races would assume the form of two eventually parallel structures, with vertical mobility on a "separate but equal" basis.

A second theory has been that poverty is the fate of a social or economic group that fell victim to adversity through some personal misfortune or misdoing. Social or economic conditions affecting a whole group play no part in the calculation. Poverty is the exclusive consequence of old-age, sickness, drink, crime, mental disease, extravagance, and similar personal predicaments. In this view, of course, it would be calamity, not color, and casualty, not class, that brings its victims to their sad estate.

A third theory has been that race prejudice is fostered by capitalists to keep control over the proletarians whom they exploit. In this view, such prejudice is a social attitude propagated among the public by an exploiting class for the purpose of stigmatizing some group as inferior so that the exploitation of either the group itself or its resources may both be justified.[3]

We have learned much about poverty and progress since the nineteenth century. The fatalistic theory that wealth is a gift of the Almighty and poverty a consoling visitation no longer appears in the approved texts. Nor do Marxian socialism or Malthusian economics any longer dominate the American intellectual horizons. Charity and philanthropy have been largely supplanted by governmental responsibility and implemented by devices designed to supply aid where the private market mechanism has faltered or personal misfortune has intervened.

Yet even the more recent thinking and the most recent policies fail to point up discrimination as one of the important and new factors in the poverty complex.

That there is discrimination which deprives certain citizens of the prospects accruing to others is accepted, at least in principle. That there are poor is also taken for granted. But that there may be a larger proportion of permanent poor among nonwhites (and other identifiable minority persons) as long as discrimination holds fast is only vaguely referred to, if at all. And where it is referred to, the feeling often persists that it is the same temporary poverty that has afflicted previous migrant groups -- i.e., the new darker "huddled masses" will ultimately see the lamp behind the golden door just as the older migrants did and their way too will be lighted to the happier plateau by the same benign oil.

Yet certain differences between past and present in-migrations are manifest. A basic factor in the state's past growth was the variety and flow of immigrants from Europe. In 1890 New York State had a foreign-born white population of over 1.5 million, constituting 26 percent of its total population. They included 14 main groups (of over 10,000), most of whom were looked upon as "minorities." There were then fewer than 80,000 members of nonwhite races. Following curtailment of immigration, the white foreign-born proportion of the state's population -- which had risen to 30 percent in 1910 -- fell to 17 percent in 1950 and the comparable percentage for the United States dropped from 15 to 7 percent. Gradually these groups disappeared into the general population. Their ghettoes dissolved or changed in character with their progress. While discrimination against the foreign-born has never been entirely eradicated, their assimilation into the mainstream of American life did on the whole fulfill the dreams of the optimists.

---

[3] Cf., Oliver C. Cox, Caste, Class and Race, Garden City, New York: 1948. For an answer to this argument, see Gordon W. Allport, The Nature of Prejudice, Cambridge, Massachusetts: 1954, p. 208.

With the war and high employment, however, the character of the migrations changed, and the new labor force has been coming increasingly from areas within the orbit of the United States. The new migrants have been mostly citizens, not foreigners, and large numbers of them are black rather than white. In 1950 fully 62 percent (516,750) of the nonwhites in New York State had migrated from their birthplace elsewhere in the country, and of those 89 percent were born in the South. Almost 200,000 people had come from Puerto Rico and it has been estimated that by 1970, nonwhite and Puerto Rican residents combined will comprise 28 percent of New York City's population as compared with 13 percent in 1950 (Ch. IV).

Primarily and ineluctably, the nonwhite is and will remain more identifiable than his European predecessors. He cannot lose his color by changing his rural dungarees for suburban flannels. Nor, with his combined handicaps of status as well as color, can he move up easily in a single generation from in-migrant to president of General Motors. Nor, if a lasting prejudice becomes fixed and widespread, is there escape for him through educational improvement alone. And unless the same opportunities are opened to him as were offered to others before him, it may be difficult to answer the charge that here at last is a permanently exploitable group and an exception to the American formula of social and economic fluidity.

The Puerto Rican, though different in characteristics, is partly identifiable by color as well, and where he is colored he is likely to be under a double handicap. Whether colored or white, however, he can get back and forth to his homeland in six hours instead of two to three weeks. Though there are no specific data to substantiate it, the pull back to the island probably accentuates transience, rootlessness, and limitations upon opportunities.

III. PUBLIC ASSISTANCE AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR POVERTY

In January 1957, a reported 289, 179 persons in New York City were receiving some form of public assistance.[4] Of these, 40 percent were nonwhite, 31. 4 percent white, and 28. 5 percent Puerto Ricans. Thus 115,834 nonwhites and 82,529 Puerto Ricans were receiving financial aid from federal, state, or local sources compared to 90,816 whites. When compared to the total population of each of the groups, the figures show that 15 out of every 100 Puerto Ricans and 12 out of every 100 nonwhites in New York City were on relief rolls. This may be contrasted with 1. 4 out of every 100 whites similarly situated.

It is probable that the high proportion of nonwhites and Puerto Ricans on relief rolls and in the aid-to-dependent children category is in part due to their in-migrant status and their non-orientation to an urban setting. It probably also results from disorganized personal and family patterns. High fertility rates among the two minority groups (each, particularly the Puerto Rican group, has a high proportion of its members in the younger age ranges) also contribute to the amount of public assistance.

Whatever the cause of the high rate of public assistance, the greater incidence of poverty in minority group communities seems strikingly confirmed.

IV. THE BARRIERS TO ADVANCE

The main blocks to an economic and social advance by minority groups, at least as they appear from the studies that follow, the Grier studies, and the case experience of the Commission, may be generally listed as follows:

1. Deficiencies in environment and home life.
2. Absence of housing, which impedes mobility and free access to areas of opportunity.

---

[4] The data are taken from a table prepared by the Bureau of Fiscal Administration, Division of Statistics, New York City Department of Welfare.

3. Community attitudes restricting hiring by industry of workers who, it is feared, might settle in the community, and the general confinement of minorities to existing concentrations in the larger cities.

4. Resistance to hiring by management -- personnel managers, line supervisors, foremen, executives, etc.

5. Educational lag and defective operation of the educational system for minorities, impeding their entry into skills and their opportunities for advancement.

6. Failure of apprenticeship and on-the-job training to function for the new minorities.

7. Deficiencies in counseling services, subjecting minority youth to misdirection or lack of direction.

8. Failure of trade schools to train or encourage minority youth to enter advantageous occupations.

9. Resistance or discriminatory practices by private employment agencies, one of the main sources of recruitment.

10. Failure by minorities to train or apply for jobs through fear, ignorance, tradition, or their unwillingness to sacrifice immediate higher-paid jobs for better long-range opportunities.

11. Opposition by unions due to long-standing traditions, ethnic homogeneity, or the outright discriminatory practices of the leadership or membership.

12. Absence of original trades acquired at the source of the migration and the inability to acquire them after arrival.

13. Existence of a back-log of unemployed among whites in some industries requiring their absorption before acceptance of outsiders.

14. Transience, impeding the sinking of roots into the community and in its available opportunities.

15. Lack of leadership, contacts, know-how, of realistic aspirations, or of opportunities for emulation.

16. Language difficulties accentuating concentration in over-competitive communities, limiting dispersion or the ability to compete for jobs requiring a knowledge of English.

Manifestly all of these obstacles could not be as thoroughly explored in the studies as might be desirable; and while they may vary in their impacts between one minority group and another and between communities, most of these obstacles have either evidenced themselves in the studies or during the proceedings in the Commission's many cases. Whether the obstacles will disappear with time will depend largely upon changes in existing patterns -- patterns of housing and environment; of attitudes; of jobs and competition for jobs; of education, training, and guidance; and of the official programs designed to eliminate the barriers and foster more equal access to opportunity.

V. HOUSING

The most recent evidence of the relationship between poverty and discrimination is suggested in the slum and in housing. Before 1940 poverty had been generally linked to the slum and to certain zones of the urban community.[5] Here was the changeless habitat of the aged poor, the crippled poor, the destitute, the mendicant, and the victims of "degeneration." Few writers then correlated the slum with the Negro or Puerto Rican ghetto. When President Franklin D. Roosevelt, for example, said that one-third of a nation was "ill-housed" as well as ill-fed and ill-clad, his vision of "ill-housed" was life in a slum composed mainly of whites.

But when the Negro migration accelerated, the slum and the

---

[5] "Thus the slum, the harbor for the impoverished and the dependent, tends to perpetuate itself; it perpetuates itself biologically as children are born into penury and privation; it perpetuates itself socially when the cultural patterns of the area are transmitted from generation to generation." Gist and Halbert, Urban Society, New York: Crowell, 1933, pp. 448-449. See also E. W. Burgess, "The Determination of Gradients in the Growth of the City," Publications of the American Sociological Society, 1926, pp. 178-184.

Negro ghetto merged almost without notice. In New York State and in many other large cities, the slum scheduled for elimination by clearance programs now became increasingly the refuge and haven of the in-migrant Negro or Puerto Rican. Surveys of slums in many cities turned into studies of nonwhite housing problems, and all the social by-products formerly linked with white slum dwellers were nowidentified with the nonwhite.[6] It was Negro urban housing that was singled out as the most deteriorated -- the national proportion of substandard housing was almost six times as high for Negroes as for whites. It was Negro housing that lacked the essential amenities -- nearly 42 percent of non-white homes lacked a private flush toilet as contrasted with 10 percent for whites. Overcrowding was greater too -- although 5 percent of white families were overcrowded in 1950, the figure for nonwhites was 18 percent, and while such overcrowding decreased for whites between 1940-50, the rate increased by more than 11 percent for nonwhites. Infant mortality, one of the main indices of poverty, was also much higher for Negroes, as were the other common manifestations of social disorganization.

The contention that the slum and the Negro concentration were now one and the same, received support from the fact that as early as 1952, of the 45,450 families to be displaced by slum clearance under the federal urban renewal program, all but 13,650 were listed as non-white. Moreover the public housing applicant with an income bringing him at or near the national poverty level was now typically a Negro and, in New York State, also a Puerto Rican. Occupancy of state-aided public housing for the lowest income group in New York City as of July 1, 1957, was 50.8 percent Negro and 20.5 percent Puerto Rican. In upstate projects Negro occupancy was now 34.8 percent despite the small relative proportion of Negro population. A study made by the New York State Rent Administrator showed that not more than 7 percent of New York City's nonwhite population could afford new FHA-aided housing in 1955.

Though the slum continued to be an index of poverty in American cities, and it had increasingly become a Negro slum, most studies continued to emphasize the relationship between poverty and the slum without identifying slum poverty with slum occupancy by the new minorities.

Coupled with the fact that it was the Negro poor (and in New York City the Puerto Rican poor also) who now predominantly inhabited the slums was another fact: The slum had become a ghetto restricted by social as well as economic compulsions. In the case of previous immigrants, the slum, the ghetto, and the slum-ghetto, had all evolved within a rough limit of choice. As economic conditions improved, the white slum dweller could move into better surroundings. He might still choose to live with his own group in a better neighborhood if he could afford it, or move into better housing in a more diversified neighborhood. For him, ability to pay rather than status or race had been the determining criterion in the dwelling market.

---

[6] See Charles Abrams, Forbidden Neighbors, New York: Harper, 1955, for the general characteristics of Negro housing.

With the new nonwhite migrations, elements of compulsion -- physical, social, economic, and sometimes even legal -- now circumscribed the movements of the new minorities, particularly of those who were nonwhite. These limitations upon their mobility were reinforced by two simultaneous developments.

1. The growth of a white suburbia.
2. An increasing emphasis on social homogeneity in American life.

In the twenty-five years preceding the end of World War II, no less than 75 percent of new developments for owner occupancy were built in peripheral sections. Between 1950 and 1956 suburbs in New York State showed the largest numerical gains, continuing a trend that had begun several decades before. The largest population gains were achieved in Nassau, Suffolk, Westchester, Erie, Monroe, and Onondaga counties, which are either urban-suburban or mainly suburban in character (Ch. IV).

Simultaneous with the suburban trend, a new accent on social status manifested itself in an insistence upon neighborhood homogeneity -- white homogeneity in particular. It sparked fears of mass Negro movements into white neighborhoods and simultaneous fears of loss of status of community associations and of diminution in real estate values. These developments diminished contacts between the two groups and intensified tensions between them.

VI. THE HOUSING PROBLEM AND DISCRIMINATION

The housing famine confronting the newly in-migrating minorities had multiple effects on the whole scheme of living: on their social position in the communities to which they came, on their opportunities in life, on the educational patterns, on their aspirations and on their children's prospects. It influenced the minority's destiny, limited its mobility, brought social distortions in the family structure, and warped the maturation and development of its younger members. Whatever efforts might be made to advance and secure the Negro's fundamental rights at the national level, the Negro's rights would continue to be violated as long as housing discrimination persisted. His right to settle down, his right to seek a job, to privacy, to temporary shelter while he sought livelihood in a new community, his right to move, and to live in a healthy environment of his choice were all inevitably impaired by the difficulty of finding a home. However firmly the courts might strike at segregation in schools, such segregation would continue when there was segregation in neighborhoods -- in fact, the latter might even now become the new vehicle for achieving the school segregation *indirectly* which the courts had outlawed *directly*. By being compelled to pay extortionate rents for the shabbiest dwellings, the new minority family was often compelled to allocate for shelter a proportion of earnings which should have been assigned for food and clothing. In New York City the Negro and Puerto Rican family often pays $20 weekly per room in a slum, a per-room rental charged the white family in the newest and most modern dwelling.

The housing shortage on the one hand and the fears and biases in the all-white districts of city and suburb on the other could not fail to exert their influences in the all-white plant as well.

The studies that follow and the Grier studies both confirm this. In each of the five cities studied by the Griers, housing emerges as the most prominent problem. The Syracuse study shows that one large company hired four Negro engineers who migrated to Syracuse to take the jobs. Each was provided with a lengthy list of "available apartments" compiled by the company with the aid of the local real estate board. After a futile effort to find such homes, three of the four engineers asked for a re-transfer. Another large corporation changed its plans about hiring Negroes when it learned of this experience. The president of Mohawk Airlines told the writer that when his company decided to change its main office from Ithaca to Utica, two competent Negro employees were compelled to quit their jobs because they could find no housing in the new community. One of the main arguments by the airlines against hiring Negro hostesses has been that they would encounter difficulty in finding housing along the routes. The Rosenberg-Chapin study (Ch. VI) quotes one employer as feeling that Negroes did not have the middle-class virtues of responsibility because "home life has a lot to do with it." Another employer said "yes, we have one colored engineer [in a company of over 10,000 employees] -- there used to be a colored chemist working here ... he left because of the housing situation." That suburban exclusion of Negroes brings social isolation and curtailment of employment opportunities seems confirmed by a top executive who said he would not hire a Negro secretary since his office was not in New York City where people are used to colored people. "Out here," he said, "there is no great contact. In New York they are accustomed to working with Negroes."

The housing shortage and discrimination affect the Puerto Rican as well. Poor housing, overcrowding, excessive rents, and family disorganization keep him from putting down roots, learning the language, and making the firm decision to settle. Insofar as discrimination against the Puerto Rican is more intense than it was against European immigrants, his adjustment is made that much more difficult. He is limited in his employment opportunities by the absence of shelter here and elsewhere where jobs beckon. The employer upstate as well as in areas outside the state fears hiring a Puerto Rican worker if the nearby community resents having him as a neighbor. The Bahamians who work in Connecticut return to their homeland voluntarily between seasons, while the Mexican wetback working in the Southwest can be returned by force. These are therefore often less of a problem for the planter and farmer than the Puerto Ricans.

VII. INCOME AND EMPLOYMENT

The Negro and Puerto Rican have found some advantages in the state not enjoyed by previous migrants -- higher employment, relief, and easier transportation. Considering the low standards prevalent at the sources of the migration, substantial economic gains have been won in their shift from South to North and from the Commonwealth to the mainland. From 1940 to 1950 the nation-wide number of Negroes in non-farm civilian employment rose from about 3 million to 5.5 million, which was proportionately a greater expansion than the labor force as a whole. With the reduction of competition from European immigration, some Negroes and Puerto Ricans have had a better chance of moving upward into the skills and professions formerly preempted by the Europeans. The gains made by Puerto Rican migrants too, coming as they do from a rural and economically depressed environment, should not be underestimated. A recent study (October 1958) by the Commission of 33 major hotels in New York City showed important gains by Puerto Ricans in many categories of hotel employment.

The average Negro in New York State is, moreover, somewhat better off than the average Negro in the United States, though 61.5 percent of the Negroes (urban and rural nonfarm) in the state and 61.3 percent in New York City reported incomes less than $2000 in 1949, a figure hardly enough for subsistence. In the same year only 39 percent of the whites reported an income less than $2000 (Ch. III).

Normally income and occupational prospects for both of these minorities might be expected to improve. The low birth rates during the depression have contracted the pool of younger labor and wartime and postwar employment have until recently expanded the opportunities for jobs on all levels.

But economic recession is always a hazard. The 1957-58 recession created an unanticipated competition by whites. It may be of long or short duration, but if it continues it can be expected to limit any upward movement by the minorities. The net in-migration of Puerto Ricans to New York State shrank in 1957 to 24,500 from 34,000 the year before. While no figures are available for nonwhite unemployment in New York State, Bureau of the Census figures[7] show that for the last ten years, nonwhite unemployment nationally has been about twice that of white unemployment. The surplus labor among Negroes seems never to have been fully absorbed even in the more prosperous years. With new competition from unemployed whites, that surplus may be expected to grow. For the inescapable fact is that a continuing disparity in unemployment between whites and nonwhites is inevitable under present patterns, i.e., as long as there is discrimination in hiring and firing; a concentration of urban nonwhites in the wage-earning groups which experience more unemployment than the salaried groups; a concentration of nonwhites in unorganized industries where seniority is not always followed in firing; a low seniority rating among nonwhites in the organized industries; and poorer education and training of nonwhites which affords them a narrower choice of jobs at all times.

In an era in which the individualistic pattern of enterprise has moved toward a trinity of big business, big labor, and big government, any concerted tendency to bar a whole group from opportunity or advancement must be viewed as invidious. With industrial concentration, the hiring policies of the many are being made by the few; in New York State today 1 percent of the employers hire 50 percent of the workers. The policies involving employment of the Negro and Puerto Rican have thereby become dependent upon the decisions of a diminishing number of personnel managers, foremen, and employers, whose attitudes of tolerance or intolerance can result in either the arbitrary exclusion or the equitable inclusion of a whole group. Circumstances may vary from community to community (each with its attitudes and needs), with the hiring policies of employers, and with the traditions and policies of unions. In Syracuse, for example, the manufacturing labor market, according to the Grier studies, is dominated by a few large employers and, except in advancement into certain fields, a non-discriminatory policy is said to be in evidence. But in Massena, New York, the scene of the St. Lawrence Seaway development, few Negroes are employed. Old patterns of exclusively white employment are gradually giving way in banking, airlines, baking, brewing and insurance; but in a number of other industries, the old traditions carry on.

---

[7] "The Monthly Report on the Labor Force," Current Population Reports, Series P-57, Nos. 1-187, Table 5. See New York State Commission Against Discrimination, Nonwhite Unemployment in the United States, 1947-1958, New York: April 1958, for a detailed analysis of these data.

So too, with the expansion of labor unions; an exclusion policy can deprive a whole group of access to an industry and often has. In the railroads, union policy kept Negroes out of certain crafts, though this pattern is now beginning to change in New York and New Jersey under the pressure of their Commissions Against Discrimination.

Increase of government power, with its vast influence on public and private employment, is complex in its implications and may operate for the better or the worse; but where discrimination is the folkway of local or state majorities, it must be for the worse.[8]

The study on executive attitudes and practices in hiring and upgrading (Ch. VI) suggests some of the obstacles in industry as well as the more hopeful prospects. Since it involves hiring practices in areas of suburban New York, the tendency toward exclusion should be expected to be greater than if it were in New York City. Policies vary among plants, but even in the most "liberal" suburban plants there are still built-in barriers to the hiring and upgrading of colored workers. Opportunities for employment of minorities often stem from management's sense of desperation during a labor shortage rather than because of its equalitarian hiring practices.

In a number of industries the feeling persists that Negroes and Puerto Ricans are peculiarly suited to manual, menial, and subordinate functions, so that upgrading takes place only in the lower ranks. Puerto Ricans as the most recent newcomers are held in low esteem -- at least for the present. (The interviews did not include the garment, hotel and other industries in which the hiring of Puerto Ricans is common and accepted.)

---

[8] Public employment of Negroes in New York State is generally fair. The policy of Governor Harriman, announced in December 1957, setting up the first comprehensive mechanism for insuring non-discriminatory hiring in state employment, is a model which other governmental units might well follow.

While Negro employment is approved in the lower ranks, and an occasional Negro makes the grade near the top, in the middle ranks exclusion policies continue. Here the general image of Negro inferiority persists and here the need for a breakthrough appears most essential.

One composite stereotype of Negro workers is that apart from the "exceptionally good" they are "less dependable, less stable, less tactful, less teachable," etc. The Negro is considered to be deficient in ambition and therefore does not go in for training. Negroes make "poor supervisors" and are not acceptable in positions of leadership (Ch. VI).

The Negro, it is felt, is capable of supervising a group of Negro porters or another Negro unit, but not a white or mixed group. While Negroes may be hired as "showpieces," i.e., to negate discrimination, these show pieces continue the exception in the plant operation. Among clerical workers, particularly among white women employees, social contact often amounts to a tabu. There is also the feeling that Negroes do not hold on to their jobs and are inherently less stable than whites, and that, in fact, "they do not want better jobs." This, of course, is part of the familiar vicious circle, i.e., Negroes who find it hard to move up in the industrial scale and to whom few promotions are given are criticized for not being motivated to strive for promotions.

There are, however, more hopeful reactions among the companies interviewed. One executive said, "I would not accept at face value a supervisor's objection to a Negro -- I'd check to see that she got a fair and reasonable opportunity -- not a prejudiced opinion." Another respondent stated, "I'd just hire Negroes and assign them to their desks. I would not consult anybody. The worst thing would be to ask -- I know what the answer would be. I would treat Negroes like anyone else..." The employer who wants integration, it is felt, should first establish in his own thinking a policy clear to himself and his people, a policy of open-mindedness. He should reject any basis for refusing to hire except lack of skills.

The report discloses that while a Negro may be unacceptable in these areas as against a white with equal qualifications, yet if the applicant is "a cut above what we might expect from the average white girl, she would be hired." Even in the case of a private secretary, a highly skilled attractive Negro girl would be hired instead of a less than attractive run-of-the-mill white girl. As some executives put it "just go ahead firmly and follow through. Worker opposition is to be expected at first -- it will quickly collapse if you are resolute."

Despite qualifications, reservations, and awareness of the difficulties, the general conclusion among these suburban employers seems to be that the barriers can be broken; that the situation is ripe for improvement; that the more Negroes prepare and qualify themselves for better jobs -- especially in technical fields -- the sooner will they find the job market welcoming them and their skills. This would be particularly so when there is a shortage of technical skills and in office work.

In addition to the other areas previously mentioned, major gains have also been made in New York City in the communications industry, in clerical work generally, in the service industries, and a breakthrough has been made in department stores including even suburban Westchester. So too substantial inroads have been made in areas and in jobs in which Negroes were formerly not seen. There are now Negro brakemen and yard conductors on the Pennsylvania Railroad, reservation clerks and other workers on the airlines, tellers in banks, clerks in insurance companies, drivers on trucks, etc. The breakthroughs even where not substantial numerically are important because they open up new fields of opportunity and aspiration.

If the goal is to be realized, however, it is not enough that industry become willing to make the breakthrough. The minority must also be qualified to accept the jobs industry is willing to offer. It must also be in a position to advance to better jobs. This means, among other things, that the minority workers must be prepared for what may be called middle-range goals, i.e., in apprenticeship, in clerical, and in supervisory positions.

VIII. EDUCATION AND EQUIPMENT FOR LIFE

Clearly if a major break in the poverty line is to be achieved for Negroes and Puerto Ricans, the elimination of discriminatory practices is not enough. Minority members must also have the equipment with which to compete for available opportunities. Acquiring this equipment begins early in life. In this connection a few pertinent facts brought out by the studies bear summary:

1. Negroes must have higher qualifications than whites to compete for jobs (Ch. VI).

2. Lack of formal schooling is more of a handicap for the Negro and Puerto Rican than for the white. While adequate schooling is essential, it takes more than education to overcome the economic handicap of minority group status (Ch. III).

3. There is a considerably higher drop-out among nonwhites than among whites in the state at the high school level. Moreover, while one

of five white high school graduates completes college, only one out of nine Negro high school graduates does so (Ch. III).

4. The schools in which the educational capacity of students is reported the lowest, where tensions between whites and Negroes are greatest, and where discipline problems are most severe appear most often in the schools which have experienced the heaviest influx of southern youngsters. White students are beginning to shun these schools and white parents are seeking transfers at an "alarming rate" (Grier study).

5. If Puerto Ricans are to improve their circumstances and secure better jobs, a good command of English is essential -- but many Puerto Ricans come without an adequate knowledge of the language (Ch. VIII).

6. Stability of the home affects the school record of youth. Negro youngsters born in the North of parents in stable homes tend to have the better records (Ch. V).

7. In Elmira, where Negroes were compared to whites from the same lower class background, "the Negroes show a more positive and constructive attitude toward school than the corresponding white youth;... the Negro expects more of himself and maintains more of a direction in his academic pursuits;... The Negroes do as well as, if not better than the whites ... according to traditional educational standards;... fewer Negroes drop out of school before graduation;... of those who have graduated, more Negroes have actually gone on to college" (Ch. V). In a city like Elmira it would appear therefore, that much of the problematic aspect of the Negro educational situation, when it exists, is directly related to being "lower status" in disproportionate numbers. In communities where the Negro population is small and which have not experienced substantial southern in-migration (such as Binghamton and Elmira), the over-all differences between Negro and white students may be few. In Binghamton a few Negro students are "superior," a few below normal, and most are in the middle or "normal" range. In a city with a large Negro influx, one counselor said that perhaps 90 percent of the Negro youngsters were in the "low-ability groups" (Grier study).

It is manifest that the educational system of the South exacts its price in the North; that it is having and will continue to have lasting repercussions upon the minority youth; that one effect is the perpetuation of the Negro at a lower cultural level and that it will continue to hamper Negro youngsters in the generation to come, depress their opportunities, hopes and ambitions.

IX. ASPIRATION AND GUIDANCE

The aspirations of minority youngsters play a vital part in their ultimate careers, in their eventual growth, and in their place in society. Levels of aspirations vary between communities and families -- sometimes they are the same as those of whites, sometimes lower and as in Elmira (Ch. V) sometimes "unrealistically higher" as compared to whites of equal status. The Elmira study suggests that many young Negroes, lacking realistic models of success among their family and friends, have set their own career objectives far beyond their ability to reach them, even without the inhibiting power of discrimination. Most, however, according to the teachers and counselors interviewed in the Grier studies, appear to be in the low ambition group.

Proper guidance counseling could help direct drives and careers; indeed, it is essential where parents are unequipped to supply it. But guidance counselors are often affected by the stereotypes of the community. Ignorance of the new opportunities that exist, failure to keep abreast of new attitudes and needs in industry, and a tendency to steer youngsters into the accepted routines limit the youngster's chances. The frustrations among the few Negroes who had been steered to high positions and failed to achieve them and a sincere if misguided tendency not to buck the prejudices of the market, as well as the sheer absence of adequate information are other factors limiting both the counselor and the counseled.

Meanwhile an industry which might hire a Negro for a good job often finds him unavailable. Few qualified Negroes, for example, have applied for jobs even in the state police. An eminent leader of the labor movement told the writer that any qualified Negro construction worker sent to him would be accepted into the building trades unions, and the Labor Advisory Committee's public commitments on discrimination have received wide notice; but a major obstacle seems to be the lack of applicants for membership. Often in the most publicized cases the number of qualified applicants appearing for the job are few despite the efforts of minority organizations to find them.

The lag between availability and demand exists for a number of reasons. One is the failure to attend school and make the grade. "If I had 50 or 100 Negro youngsters with grades of 82 or better," says one counselor, "I would have an easier time with college placement than with a smaller number of whites. Colleges are begging for Negroes these days." A bank president in an upstate city said he has for many months sought a Negro secretary and contacted many sources without success. In another city, the head of a technical training school with few Negro students reports confidently, "We would have no trouble placing Negroes in good jobs after graduation. I am sure we can place Negro graduates because there is a terrible shortage of the kind of people we train" (Grier study).

Here again the inevitable contradictions assert themselves. Where prejudice exists, the Negro is barred. But in many areas where prejudice does not exist, the Negro fails to apply; partly because few are qualified; or because of the fear that the prejudice persists; or because a tradition that has changed continues to exert its force in discouraging the minority youth to train or apply; or because of the failure of the guidance counselor to encourage such training; or because the shift involves risks of one kind or another. Chapter X describes the many ways in which discrimination perpetuates itself, even when prejudice is no longer the principal factor.

Other reasons cited are "lack of Negro leadership ... lack of social contacts ... the failure of Negroes of high status to migrate to areas of opportunity ... the shortage of skills among them ... their tendency to take the easiest path in employment ... their feeling that they wouldn't get good jobs in this town. For this reason many wondered why they should go to school ... their unwillingness to 'be the first' to pioneer ... the non-existence of housing in communities where opportunities for employment exist" (Grier study).

As long as these patterns persist, the gap between the availability of jobs and the number of qualified applicants for them will persist with it. Unless the gap is bridged, the ascent toward social and economic equalization will continue hard and frustrating.

X. FORMULATING A PROGRAM

It is difficult on the basis of these studies to resolve either the long-discussed problems of poverty or of discrimination. It is doubly difficult to resolve both, and it is not intended here to supply definitive solutions for either. But the seriousness of the problems merit a continuous exposure of the issues in the hope that some progress, however small, can be carved out. It is with this in view that the following suggestions are offered.

Whether the same pattern of opportunity as existed for immigrants up to the 1920s will exist for minorities hereafter will depend upon developments in three main areas: education and training; housing and environment; government protections and policies.

All these are interrelated. The Negro or Puerto Rican must be equipped to take the job industry offers. His equipment, in turn, depends upon his access to education and training. It hinges also upon environment and home life and upon the availability of a home at the work location. Whether such a home is available depends largely upon public policy in housing. Whether industry is ready to offer him the job and labor unions are willing to accept his membership depends upon attitudes in community and shop and upon the legal protections available to him.

In no previous era in American history has public policy been so crucial from the standpoint of civil rights and of minorities. Whether minorities fared well or badly in the past depended less upon public policy than upon the economic patterns, and these patterns -- except for the public land program -- were the products mainly of private determination. Up to 1890 the frontier was open, and one-man, small-scale, localized enterprise continued to predominate both in agriculture and trade. The society of which most European immigrants were part was hardly conducive to lasting oppression. And though xenophobia, anti-Catholicism, and class conflict erupted again as industrialization expanded, there were safety valves hidden in the economic process -- the new entrepreneurs may have cared little about equality for all men but their very competition for cheap labor acted to create a free labor market based on skill rather than national origin and capacity for work rather than breed or creed. The bias against new immigrants that burst into expression from time to time could not prevail against the sheer need for working hands. Economic opportunity and expansion, not public policy, were the primary forces that promised economic and social equality.

But with the more recent concentration of economic power in private hands and of political power in public hands, a high private and public morality has become more essential than ever before. This must be so if extension of equal opportunity to the newest groups is to be assured. So too, now that public education has attained a pivotal role in the individual's destiny, it has become incumbent upon government to assure that it is dispensed fully, adequately, and without preference to one group over another.

Finally, with greater devolution of responsibility upon government for housing and for mortgage money, these government benefits should be so allocated as to assure the availability of homes primarily for those whom the private market ignores.

Yet at no level of government are the problems of these migrating groups and minorities being dealt with comprehensively. We seem to be satisfied with prevailing theories and devices and have, as yet, shown little awareness of the deeper issues involved. In this sense, the concern of the State of New York with the problem of low income and discrimination represents an important beginning.

With the migration from the South continuing and with the Puerto Rican migration only in its first stages, it must be manifest that the low educational level of migrants is no longer a southern or a Puerto Rican problem alone but one of national concern and responsibility. What policies, private and public, can be brought to bear upon their problems?

The Challenge to Industry

Since the bulk of the opportunities for employment and advancement must come from private employers, their attitudes are of paramount importance. It is now manifest, for example, that industry must assume some responsibility for providing the essential shelter near their plants for the workers they invite. This need not mean permanent large-scale investment nor the company landlordism of the early coal-towns. With current federal programs offering a variety of formulae for individual ownership, the employer's part might be performed through sponsorship, buying the land or providing the temporary money to private builders to launch the enterprise.

A few companies have moved in this direction. But they are token efforts and the exceptions. The nonwhites who needed company help most have not benefited even from these. The organization of a Mortgage Facilities Corporation by the large lending institutions of New York State on the urging of Governor Harriman highlights a formula under which capital could be pooled for the prime purpose of making loans to nonwhite families denied such capital by the private mortgage market. If this operation were expanded and if industries and unions joined in similar ventures, nonwhite skilled workers and other families might be helped to acquire shelter. Such a program, however, could not meet the needs of the lowest-paid workers and a vastly expanded publicly subsidized program must be launched. This will be alluded to later.

Assuming that housing were to be made available to the minority workers, there would still remain the problem of their ability to pay for it, and this means securing employment at wages comparable to those of whites. Here an improved Law Against Discrimination could be helpful. If the State Commission Against Discrimination were given the right to initiate regulatory action on its own motion, it could call all the members of an industry together and obtain enforceable industry-wide agreements under which no single company in an industry could continue to practice discrimination when other companies were willing to abandon it. All would have to hire fairly and all would be better poised to face local opposition or employee bias where it existed. In the end such a policy would benefit employers by widening the pool of workers and it would set a democratic standard for the industry as a whole. If an enforceable agreement had been made with the eighteen major airlines, for example, in place of their voluntary pronouncement, discrimination in the hiring of flight personnel would have been ended in 1956.

There are, however, many things industry can do without waiting for the prodding of the law. An adequate labor force is to industry's advantage and a labor force in which talent rather than pigment is the criterion is what industry should be seeking and fighting for. Granted that some industries might choose to take the line of least resistance and employ "whites only," there is certainly a more progressive leadership which can demonstrate the example -- for their own self-interest if not for the ethical values involved. Discrimination can be a costly business when it exacts its toll in an artificially limited labor force; in higher taxes necessitated by the continued support of a poverty class; in waste of manpower through selection of workers on the basis of color instead of worth; and in the curtailment of the buying power of a large segment of the nation's population.

It is because the potential for a progressive leadership does exist in important sections of industry that progress has been and is being made. The Commerce and Industry Association of New York, for example, cooperates with the State Commission Against Discrimination; the communications industry not only cooperates through an advisory council but actually encourages cooperation by other enterprises through publicizing its example (see Ch. IX).

There are still, however, many gaps industry could fill -- in encouraging apprenticeship training in its plants; in taking positive steps to challenge employee opposition; in informing employment agencies with which it deals that it will not brook discriminatory referrals; in advancing employees on the basis of merit; in seeing to it that nonwhites are not the first to be fired when conditions are bad and the last to be hired when they are good; in taking employees from trade schools that have an open policy in training; in assuming leadership when the community in which they do business practices an unfair exclusion policy in housing or community life. The industrial executives are often the community leaders and their more positive demonstration of such leadership could set the example.

On the national level as well, executive leadership could mobilize public opinion to an awareness of the issues; it could make better use of the devices existing at the executive level for insuring compliance by all communities with their constitutional obligations. Such leadership need not center on the compulsive processes. It can also include the wise use of all the prestige inherent in the executive power to reach and build up the more enlightened elements in all regions of the country. The power to earmark funds for improvements, the use of the patronage powers and other devices which lie within the domain of the executive, are all tools in this process.

The Challenge to Labor

Much the same logic applies to unions and to leaders of labor. The ranks of labor cannot remain filled unless there are enough workers to fill them. The best interests of the unions are served when they can enroll all workers in a given trade. By exclusion practices they build up a group of outsiders who often have no alternative but to compete unfairly. Moreover as Governor Harriman put it at the meeting of SCAD and its Labor Advisory Committee on October 18, 1956, "free labor can exist only in an atmosphere of freedom ... labor's gains are bound up with the democratic faith ... free labor and race discrimination are irreconcilable ... the quest for equality of opportunity is at the core of the struggle for freedom ...." The non-discrimination pronouncement of the AFL-CIO and the agreement of the State AFL-CIO to cooperate with SCAD in ending discriminatory practices manifests labor's acceptance of these objectives.

Such objectives must be implemented by the local unions. A more positive policy of apprentice training by certain unions would do much to widen opportunities. Long-standing traditions in unions which have followed the ethnic and familial lines of a previous era need to be broken. Where initial breaks with tradition have been made on a token basis -- as in the case of the brewery industry (Ch. VII) -- these token numbers can be expanded; education among the membership can help reduce resistance where it exists. Labor leaders could also take a more positive leadership in housing in those communities in which housing is being arbitrarily denied minorities. More examples of aid to housing through loans of union funds can be undertaken along the lines of the demonstrations by the ILGWU and Amalgamated Clothing Workers.

The Challenge to Government: 1) State and Local

Yet with all the good will demonstrated by labor and management, a fundamental part still remains to be played by government. At the level of state and local government, the provision by the legislature of adequate funds for research and education could help direct the State Commission's efforts toward preventing discrimination as well as regulating it, helping to remove the barriers to equal treatment as well as simply hearing cases arising out of complaints. An important contribution would be a continuing exploration of the problems of minorities as they arise and the initiation of programs aimed at resolving them.

The recent outburst of juvenile delinquency and misconduct in schools and neighborhoods points up the seriousness of the challenge, and it can hardly be viewed as of temporary or local concern. It has its foundations in the whole complex that is interwoven with the southern pattern, that threads its way to the North as migrations increase and as the disorganization of family life in the slums takes its toll. But states and cities must be held accountable for the absence of adequate settlement houses and of proper community leadership which, coupled with overcrowding and the discouragements that inhere in urban life, are all parts of the picture.

The basic approach should be to treat disadvantaged groups not as special kinds of human beings but rather as human beings with a special kind of problem. Among the proposals deserving consideration are the designation by educational departments of specialists, skilled in dealing with their problems; appointment of more full-time counselors,[9] and an in-service training for them as well as for teachers; more clinical services in the schools to counteract the pressures of poor environment; extended use of group guidance in the junior high and elementary schools to identify and encourage talented youth; guidance work-shops for parents to avoid conflicting advice and to coordinate efforts; special guidance programs in neighborhood houses where disadvantaged youngsters tend to discuss their problems more frankly; closer cooperation between schools and public and private agencies for information on jobs and apprenticeship opportunities.

The Challenge to Government: 2) Federal

State and local agencies, however, with all their good intentions remain jurisdictionally limited. One source of substantial employment is in the interstate industries. Whether a state commission has jurisdiction over an industry hiring in another state is still a source of legal contention. While the recent agreement of twelve state governors to cooperate in joint efforts by their commissions may help meet unfair interstate violations, it is only through assumption of responsibility by the federal government, which has the right and the obligation to regulate interstate industries, that a national democratic morality can be effectively expressed and maintained.

---

[9] Many school systems use teachers part-time for this function, frequently untrained in guidance themselves. Even in New York City, where counseling receives relatively high emphasis, the ratio is: One counsellor to 600 pupils for academic high schools, 1 to 1000 for vocational high schools, 1 to 1700 for junior high schools and 1 to 18,000 for elementary schools.

Essentially poverty is a national concern involving a national responsibility. It is national economic policy that influences the economic gyrations that embrace the levels of employment and income. Poverty may exist in one state and better conditions in another, as a result of which migrations are precipitated toward the latter. Such migrations are elements of interstate commerce. Some of the migrants improve their circumstances and involve no drain on the receiving state, but in other cases they may accept jobs at less-than-subsistence levels or require public aid.

Among the workers in one section of the garment industry -- most of whom are of Puerto Rican origin -- the average weekly earnings in June 1956 of floor workers and cleaners was $42.54, of operators $49.78, and of special machine operators $50.04. The minimum wage of cleaners provided for by union contract was $32.50 (Ch. VIII). It can hardly be gainsaid that the low income levels in Puerto Rico are at least partly related to the low wages they accept in New York City. The same logic may apply to the movement of Negro sharecroppers. The state and city often pay more than their equitable share of relief costs and they pay for the low educational level of the communities from which the workers migrated. Each child brought from a depressed area involves the payment of new hundreds of dollars annually for schooling and other facilities. When the families are members of minority groups, they are deprived of free movement to suburban areas or to adjoining states, and pour into the already overcrowded slums of existing metropolises where they become the victims of all the social hazards and deprivations of slum life.

A reassessment of federal responsibility is indicated and it cannot be discharged by the exercise of the regulatory power alone, however full its impositions may be. In the long run more federal-local cooperation and more positive action is essential in all avenues in which it may prove constructive.

Not of least importance is the need for a reexamination of the function of the President's Committee on Government Contracts. This agency is a fragment in the federal colossus of economic and political power. Designed ostensibly to eliminate discriminatory practices among those benefiting from federal contracts or subsidies, it has been provided with no funds of its own and is dependent financially on federal agencies that may be involved in or are tolerant of the very discriminatory practices under question. Its budget is nominal. It has only one regional office. Its staff is inadequate. A federal Fair Employment Practices Commission would, of course, be more effective and every effort should be made to have Congress authorize it. Here again, however, the question arises as to whether the regulatory approach alone will accomplish all the results the situation requires.

Manifestly federal policing of discrimination in employment alone would ignore such essential elements as the absence of training and education for jobs, the dearth of housing, the lack of apprenticeship opportunities and the programs for improving such opportunities, the deficiencies in guidance counseling, the lack of leadership among local minorities, such problems as language deficiency and transience, the various problems and obstacles existing at the source of the migrations and the whole complex of which both discrimination and substandard incomes are a part. These various elements come under the purview of difference agencies of the federal government, but there is no one agency charged with looking at the problem as a whole, and one is needed. A Civil Rights Commission or a bureau in the Attorney General's office are of course helpful, but their powers are circumscribed; and civil rights in any event are not very meaningful in the absence of civil opportunities.

A Civil Rights Commission whose duties would include regulation against discrimination, research, education of the public, and confrontation of other elements of discrimination in American life might go a long way toward the goal. As in the case of the State Commission's formula, the regulatory process should be coupled with the educational and reinforced by funds for research.

One of the most difficult aspects of the problem is the improvement of educational opportunities. Migration to the North widens the educational opportunities of the migrants -- education in the South is often so backward that almost any change is an improvement. But it is absurd to believe that better local schools provide the complete answer. A child spends only a part of his time in the classroom. The rest of the time he is influenced by the family, the neighborhood, and the environment. Only a concerted attack on the whole pattern can effect improvement in the long run.

A Puerto Rican child who was a good child in Puerto Rico may not be able to master the conflicts and strictures of East Harlem. The Negro child may often follow a similar course when migration has broken the roots of community and family, and made family controls dependent on a mother forced to earn a living. Indeed, such a condition exists in half the state's nonwhite families -- 49 percent of the non-single nonwhite women in New York State between the ages of 20 and 44 were in the labor force in 1950.

With two-thirds of the Negro population still living in the South, and with the South the source from which the migration to the North and West will continue to flow, the focus at which improvement of educational status and opportunity is directed must be national as well as local. It calls for improvement and adequate provision of school buildings and teaching staffs in the South as well as in the North. It means more encouragement of southern Negro youth to train and study. It implies a better realization by southern parents of the need for a higher education and a better preparation for life. It means a restudy of scholarship aid programs and an increase in such aid.

Although the situation involving Puerto Rican children is in many respects similar to that affecting Negro children, some differences may be noted. The Puerto Rican child often lacks an adequate knowledge of English.[10] Teaching of English in Puerto Rico, though recently stepped up, has been held back partly by the inadequate number of teachers on the island. Learning of English on the mainland may also be hampered by the tendency of many families, particularly those of darker color, to hold on to the Spanish language as a means of distinguishing themselves from the native Negro, and by the fact that many families drift back to the island before they have been able to take advantage of a northern education.

A new attitude and a more constructive program must be evolved. If as the figures indicate, the Puerto Rican population in New York City by 1970 will equal some half the present population of the island, then major efforts on the island must be oriented to preparing the potential migrants for life on the mainland. This must include more training in those vocational skills which can be utilized here. Training of migration leaders would help. Migration by families as a unit and their guidance to areas where housing and jobs are both available might foster a more healthy family life. Since one of the main problems of the migration is that it is not sufficiently distributed among areas of economic opportunity outside New York, the opening of cheaper air routes to the West and other cities might be sought by the proper authorities. But these and other recommendations can be more clearly defined only after more constructive studies have been made of the Puerto Rican migration than those made to date.

---

[10] A 1955 study secured ratings from teachers of the English-speaking ability of the Puerto Rican pupils in the New York City public schools. The report notes: "Of the Puerto Rican pupils registered in 1955, over 50,000 or nearly 50 percent were rated A or B. For the most part those pupils had found their way into the regular classes and needed only the attention given to all competent pupils. About 34,000 were rated C or D. These understood and spoke English to some extent but still needed individual and specialized instruction. The remainder, nearly 18,000, required highly specialized instruction and much individual attention to find their way into the regular school program." See 1955-56 Annual Report of the New York City Superintendent of Schools.

The final and most important aspect of federal public policy is in housing.[11] It should be manifest that the State of New York has made a substantial effort to do its share in meeting the problem -- its total loans for public housing exceed $800 million, exclusive of annual subsidies. This exceeds what all the states of the union have done together. In addition, New York City's projects have involved capital outlays through loans or guarantees in hundreds of millions. Yet hardly the surface of the problem has been scratched -- it grows more serious daily.

Each time a single family migrates from a depressed area, a capital outlay by some public or private agency is required to supply the housing that family needs; and since private enterprise does not build for it the obligation must fall on some governmental unit prepared to put up both the capital and the annual subsidy required to bridge the gap between what the family can pay as rent and the annual carrying cost.

The federal government has conceded its obligation in eloquent preambles to its housing legislation. Admittedly it has launched housing programs and made commitments which have run into billions of dollars. It underwrites the security of mortgage loans through the Federal Housing Administration and the Veterans Administration. It stimulates mortgage loans through the Home Loan Bank System. It makes liquidability of mortgages possible through the Federal National Mortgage Association. It stimulates the flow of money into the Savings and Loan Associations by insuring their deposits. It also encourages slum clearance and investment by private builders through its Urban Renewal Program.

Yet all these programs are aimed primarily at helping the higher-income groups, the builder, and the mortgage institution. And those programs which once existed to help the low-income group are either fading from view or are being implemented so as to aggravate the position of the low-income family, notably the minority groups. The public housing program has been whittled to a shell. The urban renewal program has displaced minority families to make way for new housing they cannot afford. A system which prescribes subsidies for the better-heeled and laissez-faire for the under-privileged can hardly be described as "the American way."

It is time we realized that the primary aim of federal housing legislation should be to create decent environments rather than to pay the social costs of poor environment after the fact. The public function should be veered mainly toward benefiting those groups in the economy who are outside the field in which the private housing mechanisms operate. Finally, all aspects of existing programs which constrict or diminish the quantity of housing for disadvantaged groups should be modified and a main emphasis put on increasing the supply. Mass clearance of shelter, however it may be justified as "slum clearance" during periods of housing surplus, has little justification when its main impact is to increase overcrowding. If we accept these premises then a housing program might encompass:

---

[11] See the writer's "U. S. Housing: A New Program," New Leader, Jan. 13, 1958, supplement. Published separately in January 1958 by Tamiment Institute. See also Forbidden Neighbors, New York: 1955.

1. A mortgage loan program under which loans would be made for home-ownership to poorer families at interest rates they can afford -- the range from 0 to 3 percent.

2. A publicly-aided rental housing program envisioning the creation of neighborhoods in place of the monolithic projects now characteristic of housing programs. This means identifying those neighborhood centers of value that should be preserved and improving rather than uprooting them. It calls for building of smaller projects of a less institutionalized character and for a system of subsidies which can be available for private, cooperative, and public projects for those of moderate incomes. In public housing it calls for policies which will remove the uncertainties of tenancy and the fear of dispossession when incomes increase.

3. A policy which will emphasize vacant land operations and the selection of under-occupied sites rather than the wholesale clearance of dense concentrations with their mass upheaval of underprivileged families, as is the present tendency.[12]

---

[12] Of course one of the main obstacles to such a program will be land acquisition. It is no longer possible as in the past for cities to expand their boundaries by accession. Yet some politically acceptable answer must be found by the state and its subdivisions to the present containment of minority and low-income populations. Since the loan program for low-income families could be carried out by private builders they would not be subject to the same jurisdictional limitations as public housing authorities. But available land may also have to be secured through other devices. (See "U. S. Housing," op. cit., p. 16, infra.) The fact that considerable housing and mortgage aid comes from the federal government should enable federal agencies to condition their aid or mortgage insurance upon local communities meeting their obligations in terms of the whole region and the needs of all its people.

The Challenge to Civic and Minority Organizations

Up to now civic and minority organizations have tended to concentrate their efforts on the more dramatic aspects of minority problems. Legislation and legal issues have constituted the main focus of their interest.

Yet it should be clear that only a multilateral attack will usher in the progress the situation demands. A law outlawing discrimination in private housing is needed, but it will not afford the Negro or Puerto Rican the ability to pay the rent. Desegregation is important but will mean little if white children do not attend the "integrated" schools. Giving more teeth to SCAD is desirable, but it will not help if there are no Negroes ready for the jobs that SCAD opens up. There are, moreover, many possible advances for which legislation is not necessary. The agreements between SCAD and the New York City License Commissioner governing discrimination by employment agencies; Governor Harriman's policy on discrimination by state agencies; the working out of the Mortgage Facilities Corporation formula making mortgage loans available to minority-occupied property; the agreement between SCAD and the FHA governing punitive action against builders violating the state laws; all these are examples of the potentials that lie at the administrative level.

Pressures upon the President and the President's Committee on Government Contracts to act more vigorously than they have might help make the Committee a force for reducing discrimination. Yet such pressures have so far been minimal.

Setting up expertly staffed employment agencies skilled in the finding and placement of specialized minority personnel would be another important step forward. While the Urban League does as good a job as it can with its limited funds, an emphasis must be put on finding key people to fill the better jobs industry is willing to offer. This type of work can never be satisfactory as a routine operation.

Publicizing opportunities and gains among minority groups through broadcasting and columns that reach them would help break down hesitancy to train and apply for jobs. Talented students should be encouraged to take courses in new fields and become the inspiration for others to follow similar careers. Encouragement of youth to apply for apprenticeships would help overcome the tendency to favor the job with higher pay but less prospect. Since much of the problem centers around middle-range jobs and goals, the apprenticeship system needs careful attention and SCAD's study now in process should help define the areas where progress can be made.

Well organized campaigns in carefully selected fields of employment would help break down major barriers. The campaign by the Urban League in the brewery industry (Ch. VII) is an example. But often, the industries selected turn out to be areas for token employment only, while those where major gains might be made go ignored. Before any major campaign is undertaken, a thorough survey of the job potential in the industry should be made, accompanied by a simultaneous effort to widen the field of qualified applicants.

A thorough survey is needed of the particular obstacles to employment or advancement (such as counseling services, trade schools, apprenticeship, and so forth) and of the best means of removing them, i.e., through pressures against or better contact with employers or employers' groups, unions or public agencies, or through legislation. The obstacles should be weighted and a series of short and long-term goals prepared, accompanied by some solid, realizable programs which can be timed for fulfillment. Working with rather than against sympathetic public or private agencies may frequently go further than assuming the posture of the militant opponent. But some organizations forego gains in their tendency to assume the more tempting role of antagonist. At other times and when they should be militant, they remain dormant.

Proper contacts should be established with the general press as well. The press can be a useful tool for publicizing opportunities through news stories as well as raising the general level of community morality on discrimination. In a field where setbacks are often felt to be more newsworthy than gains, a determined effort should be made to achieve more balanced reporting.

Other advances could be made among Negroes by creating private agencies with functions similar to the Puerto Rican Migration Division, which could direct workers to cities where good opportunities for employment and housing exist. Such an undertaking would often save many migrants unnecessary expense, hardship, and frustration.

Nor has the role of the private agencies in housing been as constructive as it might have been. For a long time they fell victim to the attractions of slum clearance while members of the minority groups were being forced out of their homes. In fairness it should be added that these groups were not the only ones deluded. But it is also true that far too little pressure has been brought upon the federal housing agencies to provide housing for the minority families through existing and new programs. Funds that could have been made available for their use have instead been directed to others who need them less. There has been pressure to condition federal aid upon nondiscriminatory practices in FHA housing, but discrimination still prevails; and far from enough has been done to induce builders to undertake projects in which minorities would be accepted.

These civic agencies cannot be blamed altogether, for any full understanding of their situation would have to make allowances for their shortage of funds, for the drives made against them in the South, for their all too limited personnel and membership, for their frequent occupation with critical issues. Their leadership has been unwavering and their leaders devoted. The main problem lies in the relative public apathy. Yet in the long run, the impetus for constructive gains must come from these very organizations -- they are and will continue to be a great moving force in the preservation of American principles against the corrosive influences of prejudice and selfish interest.

The threat of poverty amidst plenty is not an idle one. If rigid economic and social stratification patterns are permitted to take root, the new identifiable minority groups may provide the first important exception in the American scheme of equal opportunity. The most effective force against this development is the unyielding concern of a responsible public and of an informed and unselfish leadership to whom the security of American principles is as vital as the security of America itself.

Part Two

BASIC FACTS

Chapter III

MINORITY GROUPS AND ECONOMIC STATUS IN NEW YORK STATE

Gladys Engel Lang

Everybody "knows" that Negroes, on the average, have lower incomes than whites. Everyone "knows" that, as a rule, Puerto Rican immigrants to New York are more apt than native-born whites to be employed in low-paying jobs. We all "know" that job-for-job within any given occupation the chances are that the Negro -- in New York State as well as in other areas -- is drawing lower wages than his white colleague and the Negro woman is more apt than the white woman to be a domestic. And there are many other aspects of the relative economic status of minority groups which everybody accepts as facts.

On the other hand not everyone sees in these facts hard evidence of discriminatory practices. In addition to the problem of ascertaining the facts, we have the problem of their interpretation. Though social scientists and educators have demonstrated the essential equality of all peoples with regard to inherited abilities -- and these findings have been popularly publicized[1] -- many people remain unconvinced that economic inequalities are essentially indices of discrimination and not reflections of innate differences. Indeed the social scientist finds it difficult to demonstrate that inequality is the product of willful or subtle discriminatory practices. For, in the face of the "vicious circle" or the "principle of cumulation," in Gunnar Myrdal's classic concept, the task of demonstration becomes a complicated one. Given the vicious circle which may lead from poverty to school dropouts to economic disadvantage to low income to discrimination and back again, we find it difficult to prove, according to any scientific canons, that we are dealing with "discrimination" and not just "disadvantage." From the economist's point of view the market may reflect disadvantage, not discrimination. So too, the sociologist tends to focus on the social conditions which gave rise to the disadvantage instead of on discrimination per se.

---

[1] See Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, Research Reports, Vol. 3, Nov. 1956, for an excellent summary article containing a 122-item bibliography in this area.

In this chapter we have set outselves the task of documenting the relative economic status of Negroes, Puerto Ricans, and whites in New York State: to document the "facts" we all "know" about the relationship between low economic position and minority group status.[2] Even though we cannot establish through these facts that the low incomes of minority groups are the product of discrimination, if by whatever index we use, all evidence points to consistent and marked inequalities between dominant and minority groups in the population, we can fairly assume that the minority status of one group and the dominant position of the other bear some meaningful relation to the economic inequalities.

In assembling the facts, wherever a choice among available data was possible, it was resolved in terms of three considerations: (1) how recent and how "original" the data were (that is, hitherto unanalyzed or unavailable in print); (2) whether the available material allowed for comparison among all or most of the groups in which we are here interested;[3] and (3) whether the data allowed for a comparison with over-all conditions in the United States or for a comparison with prior years.

The bulk of the data are drawn, first, from the publications of the Bureau of the Census, and particularly the 1950 Census of Population. The second most frequently cited source of information is a study of Health and Medical Care in New York City, part of a larger study made by The Committee for the Special Research Project in the Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York and recently published by the Harvard University

---

[2] It has not been possible here to present a definitive and exhaustive compilation and analysis of all available materials. This is a rather modest effort to bring together limited relevant data to serve as background for the other studies in the book.

[3] For instance, while the Subcommittee on Low-Income Families of the Congressional Joint Committee on the Economic Report utilized U. S. Census materials on income of family units, in this report we have used -- where Census materials are involved -- primarily statistics on the incomes of individual persons. It was only through the use of these that we could make certain comparisons among all groups.

Press.[4] (See Appendix A for Tables 1 to 30.)

The presentation and interpretation of materials follows this order: (1) a resume of some general background figures on the nonwhite and Puerto Rican population in New York State; (2) the documentation of economic inequalities between the minority and dominant groups in New York by reference to income, occupation, industrial employment, labor force participation, housing conditions, and school dropouts; (3) the documentation of facts concerning what may be called the "minorities within minorities"; (4) the documentation of certain employment patterns which tend to maximize existing inequalities; (5) a summary of what may be concluded from the statistics presented, together with some suggestions of problem areas for study.

I. THE NONWHITE AND PUERTO RICAN POPULATION OF NEW YORK STATE

Nonwhites (USA)

The nonwhite population of the United States in 1950 was about 15,757,000, or roughly 10.5 percent of the total population. It has been estimated that this population by 1956 had increased to 18,268,000, or about 10.9 percent of all persons in the USA. Negroes comprise more than 95 percent of the nonwhite group, so that data for nonwhite persons as a whole reflect essentially the situation of Negroes and may be used as a satisfactory substitute wherever data on Negroes are not separately available.

In 1940 almost half (some 47.9%) of the nonwhites lived in urban places, and this proportion was up to about 61 percent by 1950. By 1960, according to the best estimates, we can expect the proportion of nonwhites living in urban areas to be considerably increased.

Nonwhites (New York)

In 1950 of all the nonwhites in the United States, 958,097, or roughly 6 percent, lived in New York State. The nonwhites constituted about 6.5 percent of the total population in the state and lived largely in the urban areas. About 81 percent (775,529) of the state's nonwhites lived in New York City; Buffalo, with 37,700 nonwhites in 1950, had the second largest Negro community.

---

[4] We wish to acknowledge the generosity of Dr. Paul M. Densen, Director, Division of Research and Statistics, Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York, in making available to us the part of that inquiry involving an "area probability sample" covering 13,558 persons in 4190 households in New York City in 1952. This study is hereafter referred to as the New York City 1952 Survey.

The sizeable nonwhite population of New York City, representing some 9.8 percent of its total residents, constituted an absolute increase of about 62.4 percent over 1940. The absolute size of the city population emphasizes the urban character of the state's nonwhite population; the sizeable increase during the decade reflects, of course, the movement during the war years of Negroes into defense work and their continuing cityward migration in the years of prosperity and changed expectations that followed the war.

Current Population Trends

The movement of nonwhites northward and to urban areas is continuing. For example, this trend is reflected in statistics for Buffalo (see Table 30). Although Buffalo's total population changed little between 1950 and 1955, its composition altered significantly. Migration out of the city during 1950-55 was almost entirely white; on the other hand, nearly half the population moving into the city was nonwhite. While in 1950 nonwhites made up 6.5 percent of the Buffalo population, in 1955 the proportion was estimated at about 9 percent. Newcomers among nonwhites accounted for two-thirds of the estimated gain.[5]

Potential Labor Force

How many of the nonwhites are 14 years of age or over and, by inference of Census definition, potential members of the labor force? In 1950 the population was distributed as in Table III-a.

Within the New York portion of the SMA the nonwhites thus made up about 9 percent of the "potential" labor force. In the state as a whole the figure is somewhat over 6 percent.

---

[5] See Chapter IV for more detailed demographic analysis and 1957 population estimates.

Table III-a. Population 14 Years and Over in 1950

	Male	Female	Total
New York portion of N.Y.-N.J. SMA[a]:			
Whites and nonwhites	3,611,535	3,976,330	7,587,865
Nonwhites	295,425	366,150	661,575
Nonwhites as percentage of total	8.1	9.2	8.7
New York State:			
Whites and nonwhites	5,547,045	6,042,050	11,589,095
Nonwhites	339,145	403,695	742,840
Nonwhites as percentage of total	6.1	6.7	6.4

[a] The "New York portion" of the New York-Northeastern New Jersey Standard Metropolitan Area consists of the five counties of New York City plus the four suburban counties of Westchester, Rockland, Nassau, and Suffolk.

The Puerto Ricans

General statistics on New York's Puerto Rican population, our "newest migrants" as they have been called, appear in a number of recent and widely known publications. A special report was also made in connection with the 1950 Census.[6]

In 1950 there were 301,375 persons born in Puerto Rico or of Puerto Rican parentage residing in the continental United States. Of these, 226,110 were born in Puerto Rico, an increase of 223 percent over the 1940 figure. (No 1940 data are available for continental residents of Puerto Rican parentage.) Of the 1950 Puerto Rican-born population of the United States, 191,305 (84.6%) lived in New York State. Their location was thus somewhat less concentrated than in 1940 when 90.4 percent of the Puerto Rican-born were living in the state. In the decade 1940-50 there was an increase in migration to other sections of the country, particularly the North Central and Southern regions. Yet the fact remains that not only did the great majority of Puerto Rican-born persons reside in New York State, but 98 percent (187,420) of those in the state in 1950 lived in New York City. The 1950 Census reveals that of persons born in Puerto Rico or of Puerto Rican parentage, 245,880 were in the city, of whom 114,300 were male and 131,580 female. These were predominantly white. The sex and color composition of those 14 years of age and older is shown in Table III-b.

---

[6] See New York City Department of City Planning Bulletin, "Puerto Rican Migration to New York City," Feb. 1957; Welfare and Health Council of New York City (now Community Council of Greater New York), Population of Puerto Rican Birth or Parentage, New York City, 1950, New York: 1952.

Table III-b. Persons Born in Puerto Rico or of Puerto Rican Parentage 14 Years or Older in 1950, New York City

	Total	White	Nonwhite[a]
Male	79,505	74,235	6,270
Female	96,895	89,500	7,395
Total	176,400	163,735	13,665

[a] With the exception of internal Puerto Rican breakdowns, all data in this chapter refer to nonwhite Puerto Ricans in the "Puerto Rican" rather than the "nonwhite" category.

The Department of City Planning estimates that as of December 31, 1956, there were about 550,000 Puerto Ricans in New York City, of whom about 75 percent were born in Puerto Rico.

II. THE ECONOMIC STATUS OF MINORITY GROUPS IN NEW YORK: DOCUMENTATION

Income

The pitfalls of using incomes (individual or household) for comparative purposes are well known. In indexing trends we have to consider changing dollar value. Also, in the case of household data, we have to take into account the presence in some units of more than one source of income: If one group in the population has a higher average income level than another, this may reflect not the higher income of individuals in the group, but rather a larger number contributing to the household income. When we employ statistics on incomes of individuals, sizeable proportions of part-time and marginal workers among some groups in the population may depress the "average" individual income. Hence, generalizations from the statistics to be cited must take account of these and other complicating considerations (not the least of which is the fact that individuals often for one reason or another falsify their income reports).

Keeping these caveats in mind, the following points can be made:

1. Judged by "individual" income, the average Negro in New York State is better off than the average Negro in the United States (Tables 6 and 8). For instance, of Negro persons 14 years and over residing in urban and rural nonfarm areas of the United States in 1949 and reporting income 75 percent earned under $2000 per year. On the other hand, only 61.5 percent of Negroes in urban and rural nonfarm New York State reported incomes less than $2000, and the percentage in New York City was 61.3. The differences appear less marked when individuals with incomes under $3000 are considered. These comprised 93 percent of the Negroes in urban and rural nonfarm United States; 89.2 percent of those in urban and rural nonfarm areas of New York State; and 89.3 percent of Negroes in New York City.

2. On the other hand, the distribution of income among whites living in New York State and reporting income was considerably higher than that of Negroes. In 1949 among people in urban and rural nonfarm areas of the state having income, only 39 percent of the whites reported an income of less than $2000 per year (as compared to 61.5% of the Negroes). Among the higher income groups, the discrepancy is increasingly apparent: 37 percent of the white group residing in these areas (compared to only 11% of the Negroes) had incomes which topped the $3000 mark (Table 6).

In 1956, 32.9 percent of whites in New York State with incomes reported an income of less than $2000. The comparable figure for nonwhites was 42.2 percent. In that year 53 percent of the whites had incomes of $3000 or more, compared to 28.3 percent of the nonwhites.

3. In terms of access to the goods money can buy there is something of a hierarchy among minorities. (See the discussion of the "Minorities Within the Minorities" below.) The figures for New York City in 1949 are indicative (Table 8). The nonwhite Puerto Rican, a candidate for double discrimination, was "worst off." The median income of those with an income was $1513. Only 6.4 percent of the nonwhite Puerto Ricans had incomes of more than $3000, while about 69 percent had less than $2000. Next came the Puerto Ricans classified as whites; slightly more, 9 percent, had incomes above $3000 while 65 percent received less than $2000. Negroes were somewhat better off but the whites were considerably the most favored. Some 36 percent of the whites received under $2000 and 38.6 percent reported over $3000.

This same rank order is found on examination of the New York City 1952 Survey. The data refer to total household income, that is the total income of any one household whatever its composition. Unfortunately for comparison purposes, the number of nonwhite Puerto Ricans in the sample was so small as to make separate analysis meaningless. Table III-c is a summary of some pertinent data from Table 9.

Table III-c. Incomes of White, Nonwhite, and Puerto Rican Households, New York City, 1952 (percentage)

	Households with Income	
Group	$2000 and Under	Over $3000
Puerto Rican	30.6	34.1
Nonwhite	26.8	41.0
White	12.6	71.8

4. Is the economic situation of the minority groups improving? The significance of the data on incomes cannot be considered outside the context of general economic trends. Thus we all believe that today times are better than before World War II. We should expect to find, as we do, that the incomes of the general population, both white and nonwhite, were considerably higher in 1950 and after than in 1940. Yet what appears to be a considerable gain may be in part spurious. For instance, the U. S. Senate Subcommittee on Low-Income Families has shown that in 1948 about 9.6 million United States families (25%) had annual incomes under $2000, as compared with 8.3 million (or 20%) in 1954. What appears to be a substantial reduction in the proportion of low-income families, however, proves to be pretty much of a statistical mirage, the subcommittee noted; for when incomes are

adjusted to take account of the change in purchasing power, little change in the number of low-incomes families is evidenced.

Has the economic situation of minority groups improved as rapidly as or more rapidly than that of the dominant groups in recent decades? It has been demonstrated and emphasized in a number of studies that the income of nonwhites has risen in relation to that of the whites. For instance, in 1939 the median wage and salary income in the United States of nonwhites was only 38 percent of the median for whites. By 1950 the figure for nonwhites expressed as a percentage of whites had risen to 52. Happy as this finding may be for those who deplore inequalities with roots in prejudice, we must remember that the picture is more encouraging statistically than in real terms. To hold his position relative to the white, the nonwhite's income need rise only proportionately, not absolutely, as much as that of the white's. After all, it takes two units to double two units; it takes four to double four. Measured in actual dollars, the increase for the individual nonwhite from 1939 to 1950 was $931 compared with $1525 for the white. The dollar gap did not narrow but widened. At the same time it must be observed that $50 added to a $1000 income may mean more to the recipient than the $100 added to $3000.

The contrast between the depression year of 1939 and the far less difficult year of 1950 obscures what part of the gain may be long-run and what part of the relative increase simply reflects the relative general prosperity. There are indications that the Negro gain may be sensitive to the ups and downs of the business cycle.[7] The year-by-year figures of the nonwhite median income of urban families expressed as a percentage of the median white income shows some fluctuations during the years 1945-49 (Table 2). It reached a peak of nearly 67 in 1945 during the wartime labor shortage. By 1947 it had dropped a full ten points, a drop from which it apparently recovered but slowly.

It may be added, incidentally, that national figures on income trends reflect the urbanward movement of the Negro in the last decades. One would therefore expect the relative position of the highly urbanized nonwhite in the North -- and in New York State -- to exhibit a less marked improvement. This seems actually to be the case. A comparison of available data for the Northeastern Region of the United States (Table 5) indicates that in 1949 nonwhite males had a median income which was 76 percent that of the median income for all males. In 1954 the proportion had increased to 79.4 percent, that is, by only 3 percentage points. And the position of nonwhite females had actually deteriorated in relation to that of all females. While in 1949 their median income was 84 percent that of all females, it had declined to 80.7 percent by 1954. This apparent loss of ground by nonwhite females constitutes an interesting area for inquiry.[8]

---

[7] Cf., New York State Commission Against Discrimination, Nonwhite Unemployment in the United States, 1947-58, April 1958.

The most recent available data for New York State likewise suggest that the income gap between whites and nonwhites is not closing. In one of its early reports (Bulletin No. 3, Part 1, Nov. 1958) the Interdepartmental Committee on Low Incomes provides comparative income data by color for 1949 and 1956. In the former year, the median income of all nonwhite income recipients 14 years and over was 70.5 percent of the white median income. In 1956 the figure was 70.8 percent. There was, however, an important difference in the trends of males and females. The relative status of the nonwhite male declined in these years: nonwhite male median income expressed as a percentage of white male median income was 71.2 in 1949 and 66.9 in 1956. The status of nonwhite females improved markedly: the figures in the two years were 81.6 and 99.1.

Occupations and Labor Force Participation

Data on the distribution of occupations among various groups in the economy and on labor force participation rates serve to corroborate the points made on the basis of income data. At the same time, they supplement and round out the picture.

1. Available data are generally interpreted to mean that in terms of occupational status in the country as a whole the Negroes have been improving their economic position. They have been moving out of farm labor and into operative and semiskilled jobs. There are now, in comparison with 1940, also more Negro craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers and more clerical workers. Males are moving to occupations of greater

---

[8] The rapid rise of employment of women in their forties of all races shown in the U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports -- Labor Force, "Women Past 35 in the Labor Force, 1947 to 1956," Series P-50, No. 75, July 1957 may be a significant factor here, assuming that these women take adequately paying jobs. Unfortunately the 1949 data do not give figures for whites only, and the 1954 data omit totals for both sexes. There is also a possibility of income not reported by self-employed such as domestics. The comparison of "persons with income" in the various groups is not discussed in the text although statistics are included in Appendix A. Labor force participation rates and the analysis of unemployment appear more meaningful.

prestige but are still located predominantly in the lower-paid jobs. Negro women are changing from domestic employment to operative work, but nonwhite women still make up most of the population employed in domestic service.

On a nationwide basis labor force participation rates of white and nonwhite males have moved in the same direction and diverged only slightly over the years. Nonwhite women continue to have participation rates much higher than those of white females.

2. One of the interesting changes which has come about is the movement of Puerto Rican women almost completely out of domestic service, an occupation to which earlier Puerto Rican in-migrants had quite frequently turned. By 1950 in New York City only 2 percent of Puerto Rican women were employed as domestics in private households, while 77 percent were engaged as operatives in manufacturing industries. What this change has meant in terms of actual financial gain and how it has altered their position relative to nonwhite females would be interesting to consider. The shortage of domestic help as well as the beginning of improved conditions in domestic service (especially in terms of social security coverage) reduce the likeliness that the income situation of operatives is better than that of full-time domestics. On the other hand, to the extent that Puerto Rican women are employed in well-organized industries, their economic status may be regarded as improved. And to the extent that employment as an operative is considered to have more prestige, their socio-economic rating is advanced.

3. In New York City (1952), as nationally, a larger percentage of whites than of nonwhites with incomes were found in white-collar occupations. Here again the rank order of minorities is observed: 38 percent of the whites, 24 percent of the nonwhites, and about 11 percent of the Puerto Ricans were so classified. There is actually no one-to-one ratio between income and white- or blue-collar position, but in general white-collar occupations allow for greater economic advancement over the years.

4. Statistics for New York City confirm the movement of minority groups up the occupational ladder, but they also reveal their relatively inferior and less secure positions within given niches.

The New York City 1952 Survey classified somewhat over one-third in each of the three groups considered here as "craftsmen, operatives, foremen, and laborers" (Table 18). However, an analysis of the total incomes of white, Puerto Rican, and nonwhite households whose heads were in these occupations indicates that members of minority groups, while they have "moved in," seem to hold the less well-paid and presumably less skilled jobs within these occupations. Only about 5 percent of the white households whose heads were "craftsmen, operatives, etc." received $2000 or less per year, but 19 percent of the nonwhite and as many as 32 percent of the Puerto Rican households were below this mark (Table 10).[9]

Industrial Affiliation

1. Nationally nonwhites are under-represented in manufacturing industries, reflecting the general under-representation of Negroes in skilled jobs. Nonwhites are more numerous in personal service industries and more likely to be employed in agriculture. The wholesale and retail trades as well as finance, business services, and so forth, are more largely white industries. Between 1948 and 1955 there has been an influx of nonwhites into governmental positions. On the whole the national picture is fairly well duplicated by New York State, with the exception that, since nonwhites here are largely urban, there are few agricultural workers among them.

2. The New York City 1952 Survey data, when analyzed to give a picture of status within industry, underline the findings already cited. Of those with jobs in manufacturing, about 70 percent of the whites in New York City were in blue-collar occupations, while over 90 percent of the nonwhites and virtually all of the Puerto Ricans were so placed. In the world of finance, insurance, real estate, and service, almost two-thirds of white males were occupied in professional, managerial, or other white-collar spots, compared with about one-half of the nonwhite males and some 16 percent of the Puerto Ricans (Table 20).

3. Comparison of industrial affiliation is a meaningful index of economic status if supplemented by analysis of occupations within industry and of the prospects of the various industries themselves. Tables 12 and 13 showing the industrial affiliation of Puerto Ricans, whites, and nonwhites in New York State and New York City, should be considered in connection with an analysis of industrial trends. The significant questions are whether

---

[9] A similar analysis of persons employed in clerical and sales occupations shows that the percentage of nonwhites employed in such a capacity is much smaller than that of the whites. There are no marked differences in the distribution of salary or income in the various brackets, though there are too few Puerto Ricans employed in these occupations to make such a comparison meaningful. Differentials in income do appear in service (other than domestic) occupations: the Puerto Ricans are considerably less well off. And, so far as income is concerned, white professionals are better off than nonwhite professionals.

minority groups are more largely concentrated than whites in industries subject to periodic and seasonal unemployment, and whether they are employed primarily in contracting or in expanding industries. (See Chapter IV for a discussion of this problem.)

Other Indices

1. Statistics on rent paid are notoriously inaccurate as clues to individuals' economic status, and their inaccuracy has been increased by postwar housing shortages. In comparisons between nonwhites and whites this inaccuracy is particularly acute.

The 1950 Census shows that nonwhite families in New York City paid a greater portion of their income in the form of rent than did white families with similar income. But the high rents paid do not mean that nonwhite families enjoy better housing. On the contrary, white households, while significantly smaller, have almost the same number of sleeping rooms at their disposal as nonwhites and Puerto Ricans, according to the New York City 1952 Survey (Table 25). Some 15 percent of both nonwhite and Puerto Rican households, moreover, shared a toilet with other households, while only 6 percent of the white households lacked exclusive use of their facilities. Also a somewhat larger proportion of the whites than nonwhites and Puerto Ricans had central heating.

What the high rents mean with regard to ways of living can be further deduced from the amount of doubling-up, which is considerably more common among nonwhites and Puerto Ricans than among whites. For example, a 1955 survey in Buffalo confirms the existence of disproportionately crowded and substandard housing conditions among nonwhites in that area (Table 26).

2. School dropouts have sometimes served as indices of economic status. But since school children in the state are nowhere in official school records identified by race, comparative statistics on school dropouts must be arrived at by indirect methods. In this case we have used data on school enrollment.

Statistics for the United States as a whole show that the enrollment of nonwhites still lags behind that of the general population. Census materials for 1950 show that New York State compares favorably with the United States as a whole in this respect. In the 14-17 age group, 76 percent of the nonwhites in the United States were enrolled, compared with 84 percent in the state. Within the state there was a considerably higher dropout among nonwhites at what appears to be the high school level (Table III-d).

Table III-d. School Enrollment, by Single Years of Age by Color, 14-19 Years, New York State, 1950 (percentage)

Age	Enrolled in School Total	Nonwhite
14	95.6	95.0
15	94.8	92.7
16	87.8	85.3
17	73.3	65.2
18	41.3	32.4
19	28.4	18.2

Source: U. S. Census of Population: 1950, Vol. II, P-C32, New York, Table 62.

Whether the higher rate of school dropouts is a simple consequence of low economic status and the needs of the family we cannot say; be this as it may, in terms of the future economic status of nonwhites this relatively early departure from formal schooling means much. (Cf., Tables 27, 28 and 29.)

III. MINORITIES WITHIN MINORITIES

All the data presented in the foregoing sections seem to point to the relatively lower -- indeed, positively low -- economic status of the nonwhite and the Puerto Rican in New York State. The data, moreover, point to a rank order of disadvantage in terms of access to the goods money can buy. But beyond this there are minorities within these minorities; there are factors which compound the disadvantages among certain groups within the minority groups as such.

First, there is the recent Negro in-migrant to New York. There is a division between the northern-born and/or long-term resident of the state and the southern-born, more recent arrival. For instance, it is common knowledge that the going rate for a houseworker in parts of New York City is about ten dollars a day. Yet private employment agencies advertise "Girls Just Up from the South" as full-time workers for thirty-five dollars a week. Current statistics on income, occupation, and industrial affiliation of Negroes in New York may minimize gains of the many more skilled and better educated long-term residents. But there are no reliable statistics, so far as can be ascertained, comparing long-term residents and recent in-migrants within the Negro population.[10]

Second, there is the nonwhite Puerto Rican. We have already alluded to this low man on the totem pole, and even less economically fortunate than he is the nonwhite Puerto Rican female. A special study of this double (and even triple) "minority" is certainly in order.

Third, there is the Negro female, sinned against once on account of race, and again by virtue of her sex. This is shown clearly by the distribution of income shown in Table III-e. This situation may, however, be changing, as indicated by the 1956 data presented on page 58.

Table III-e. Incomes of Persons by Sex and Color, New York City, 1949 (percentage)

Sex and Color		Persons with Income Under $2000	Persons with Income Over $3000
Females:	Negro	78.6	3.5
	White	54.9	16.6
Males:	Negro	45.5	27.1
	White	27.1	50.5

Source: U.S. Census of Population: 1950, Vol. II, P-C32, New York, Table 87.

The statistics on persons receiving an annual income under $2000 probably reflect to some extent the lower wages of part-time workers among Negro women in the labor force. But this is hardly the sole explanation, as indicated by the equally striking Negro-white difference among males. Negroes, according to national patterns, are more apt than whites to work part-time (less than 35 hours a week); and "economic reasons" (slack work, inability to find full-time work, and so forth) reinforce this tendency. The minority status of the female, and particularly the Negro female, is marked.

---

[10] The special census carried out in New York City in April 1957 for the New York State Interdepartmental Committee on Low Incomes is expected to provide data which will help fill this gap.

A higher percentage of Negro than of white women is in the labor force. Analysis of the New York City 1952 Survey provides clues as to "why they work." Table 24 shows that a higher proportion of Negro and Puerto Rican women are married and in the labor force (either living with their husbands or not). Though marriage is not on the face of it evidence of responsibilities for family (child) support, the statistics indicate that more women in the minority groups than in the white majority work to support their dependents.

Fourth, there is the older, or aging, worker. Like sex and educational attainment, the general relationship between age and low income has been pointed out in various studies (for instance, by the U. S. Senate Subcommittee on Low-Income Families). One problem which must be raised is this: Is againg more of a problem for the worker among minority than among dominant groups? Unfortunately, data on the relative percentages of the various groups in the labor force at given ages are difficult to interpret. Thus in New York City (1952) about one-third of the Puerto Ricans, 60 percent of the nonwhites, and somewhat over half the whites aged 55-64 were in the labor force. But is it a sign of discrimination against the whites that a smaller percentage is still working, or a sign that more were free, for one reason or another, to retire from the labor force? In another effort to determine the "compounding" effect of aging, an analysis was made of the New York City 1952 survey data of different occupations by age groups, that is, of the percentage of whites, nonwhites, or Puerto Ricans of given ages employed in particular occupations. While such analysis gave rough evidence of the fact that aging works more against minority groups than against the whites, it is hardly conclusive.[11]

Fifth, there are the illiterate and uneducated among minority groups. That the percentage of Puerto Ricans and nonwhites completing elementary or high school is far smaller than that of whites is well known, and the statistics for New York State and New York City (for N. Y. C., 1952 see Table 27) bear out this differential. Again, the question is this: Is lack of formal schooling more of a handicap for minority groups in the labor force than for the dominant groups? The 1952 Survey data were analyzed to compare the percentage of persons in each population group with eight years or less of schooling completed and the percentages of each group with nine or more years of schooling completed employed in what may be generally called white-collar jobs.

---

[11] According to the analysis, it would seem that though nonwhites and Puerto Ricans are employed as "craftsmen, operatives, etc." at an earlier age and comprise a comparable percentage of those in the occupation during the middle years (45-54), from age 55-64 and especially after 64, older workers among the nonwhites and Puerto Ricans groups are less likely to be employed. The older worker among these minority groups may be victims of "double discrimination."

Table III-f. White-Collar Employment Among Puerto Ricans, Nonwhites, and Whites With Eight Years or Less and Nine Years or More of Schooling, New York City, 1952 (percentage)

	With White-Collar Jobs	
Group	8 Years of Schooling or Less	9 Years of Schooling or More
Puerto Ricans (98)	10.0	11.0
Nonwhite (236)	16.0	39.0
White (1450)	26.0	63.0

It seems clear from Table III-f that a lack of formal schooling is more of a handicap to the Negro and Puerto Rican than to the white. At the same time it indicates that it takes more than schooling to overcome the economic handicap of minority group status.

IV. EMPLOYMENT PATTERNS AND OTHER FACTORS MAXIMIZING INEQUITIES

It can be established that in terms of income the Negro and the Puerto Rican in the community are considerably worse off than the white. Beyond this, there are other patterns which compound the differentials and maximize the deprivation of the minority groups.

First, there are certain employment patterns which are translatable into occupational experience. We mean by this such phenomena as seasonal work, periodic employment, long terms of unemployment, the uncertain nature of income, lack of social security coverage, and unequal pay for equal work.

For instance, the Bureau of the Census has shown that in 1955, considering the United States as a whole, there was a relatively greater incidence of involuntary part-time work among nonwhites. Also the rate of unemployment among nonwhite workers was much higher; in 1955 the rate for men 25 to 44 years of age -- most of whom are family breadwinners -- was three times as high for nonwhites as for whites. More of the nonwhites were in domestic service, where frequent though brief periods of unemployment are common; fewer were in mining or manufacturing where unemployment, if it occurs, is of relatively longer duration. (This makes duration of unemployment a poor index of relative economic status.)[12]

By way of another example, analysis of the unemployed (those in the labor force looking for work) in the New York City 1952 Survey reveals the same pattern of relative deprivation: more Puerto Ricans (13%) than nonwhites (6%) and more nonwhites than whites (4%) were in the market for jobs at the time of the survey. This was, of course, under conditions of near full employment, and such differentials may be expected to be exaggerated in periods of less full employment.

It can also be seen (Table 23) that nonwhite and Puerto Rican craftsmen, operatives, foremen, and laborers in the New York City 1952 Survey were unemployed out of proportion to their numbers in the labor force. It may be noted that white females were also disproportionately represented.[13]

There are other less tangible factors, often stemming from conditions of poverty as such, which tend to perpetuate economic deprivation and to sharpen the meaning of poverty to the individual and to the group.

There is, for instance, the effect of "contacts." How do you learn about jobs? How are you steered into one occupation rather than another? And how do you go about securing a job? The fact that persons with low incomes are restricted in their choice of housing is obvious; that persons in minority groups with low status are even more limited is also known. Limited contacts mean limited chances for bettering one's economic position.

---

[12] See U. S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports -- Labor Force, Series P-50, No. 66 (March 1956).

[13] We have included no statistics on the level-of-living effects of unequal pay for equal work (especially among women in minority groups), of Old Age and Survivors Insurance coverage, and other pertinent data. Such factors, of course, also affect actual income levels.

There is also the effect of expectations of discrimination, partly stemming from lack of contacts but also growing out of experience. Minority groups come to "know" that "certain jobs are not for us." There is "no sense in applying." Particularly to the extent that such expectations affect the type of training sought in school and the length of formal schooling, such expectations tend to help ensure the duration of present inequalities.

We must consider also the effect of the lack of know-how in the economic market on the efficacy with which the low income is utilized. When minority groups with low incomes are virtually cut off from personal contact with other groups, they are apt to take little advantage of certain services available to them: legal aid, free clinics, loan funds, and so forth. Such community services supplement the incomes of many families. The significant questions are whether minority groups make as much use of such services as other persons on the same economic level, and under what circumstances minority groups are most apt to make use of them.

There is also, of course, the effect of the immobility which attends low income. It is quite evident that a certain amount of money is required for people to move from city to city in search of improved economic opportunities. Language handicaps, such as Puerto Ricans have, and the racial discrimination in housing and schooling which Negroes face would make such immobility even greater among these minority groups in the low-income brackets.

Finally, by way of example, we may allude to the effect of employment in industries which, for whatever reason, put a low priority on retaining the minority worker. Minority groups have been moving up the economic and occupational ladders. But how firm is their grasp? Are they disproportionately represented in service occupations and connected with luxury industries (hotels, for example) which are most expendable in any recession? Are they in unorganized industries or in positions of low seniority so that they are most vulnerable to economic fluctuations?

No statement on the relationship between minority status and economic position can overlook the significance of factors such as these. The extent to which they help to minimize the buying power of low income and to maximize the insecurity of low income among minority groups and thus underline the low level of the income needs further study.[14]

---

[14] Certain other factors which also make for maximum insecurity, such as mental and physical illness, have not been dealt with here. It may be added that the physically handicapped among minority groups may also be subject to more discrimination than those among white groups. In addition, statistics on mental and physical illness may serve as indicators of the "economic status" of the various groups. The relationship between incidence of such illnesses and minority group status is, however, complicated and any discussion has, therefore, been omitted.

V. CONCLUSIONS

The facts of economic status presented here illustrate over and again the relationship between minority group membership and economic status. They evidence the very real relationship, complicated as its explanation may be, between discrimination and low income.

Whether measured by income, occupation, industrial affiliation, or other indices, the nonwhites in New York are on the average better off than nonwhites in the United States as a whole. Within New York there is, however, as illustrated particularly on the basis of 1952 and 1950 data, a rank order of economic status. The white person is better off than the nonwhite and the nonwhite better off than the Puerto Rican. Beyond this, there are certain minorities within the minorities: "Minority status" as females, older workers, the uneducated, newcomers, physically handicapped, and so forth, may compound the effects of their status as nonwhites or Puerto Ricans.

We can also surmise that certain employment patterns experienced by nonwhites and Puerto Ricans out of proportion to their numbers in the population -- such as frequent or periodic unemployment, inability to find full-time work, and instability of employment -- sharpen the effects of lower economic status. Other conditions, such as limited contacts, lack of knowledge of community resources, and immobility -- the effects of which are not as readily or precisely measured -- ensure and compound the everyday significance of the low level of economic well-being.

There is evidence that the economic status of the average Puerto Rican and nonwhite, relative to the other groups in the United States, has been improving during the past decades. Some improvement may be noted in New York State, but how widespread or how evenly spread such gains are cannot be fully documented at the present time.[15]

Before we can "predict" with any assurance what the future holds for our minority groups we need to know more about the component groups within our Negro and Puerto Rican populations. Most noticeable is the need for information on the new in-migrants to the Negro community. If these consist largely of unskilled and unschooled workers, we should expect the proportion of persons with low income among nonwhites to shrink quite slowly, however much the individual positions of better educated, more highly skilled Negroes in the community may improve.

---

[15] See Ch. IV, Part IV for an analysis of the shifts in occupational distribution.

Similarly, what many think to be a general improvement in the economic well-being of many Puerto Ricans in New York City may not be reflected in "average" statistics. For instance, the economic position of those in New York for ten years or more may by 1960 show considerable improvement over 1950; nevertheless, the median income and the proportions of Puerto Ricans with low incomes may remain pretty much as before, given a continued in-migration.

The sex, age, color, educational, marital, and occupational composition of in-migrants should rate a high priority for study; for information on the economic position of what we have called the "minorities within the minorities" would help us to interpret the "average" figures with which we so often must work, as well as to understand the over-all trends which are reported from time to time.

Current disagreements often revolve about whether the economic problems of our Puerto Rican and Negro minorities are essentially different -- the former being viewed largely as a result of suspicions of and discrimination against "foreigners" (or newcomers, generally) and the latter as the product of discrimination on account of color and thus a more deep-rooted and complicated antipathy. The low economic status of the Puerto Rican is therefore viewed as a relatively short-range phenomenon, bound to improve as the Puerto Ricans become acculturated and lose their old identities in the larger community as other "foreigners" have done before them.

Be this as it may, neither the distinctions between sources of discrimination nor prognostications by analogy are apt to give us the "answers" we need. Up-to-date and accurate statistics on various groups within the minority communities are necessary if we are to round out the picture of the low-income groups and specify the significant areas for further research and action.

Chapter IV

SIGNIFICANT TRENDS IN THE NEW YORK STATE ECONOMY: With Special Reference to Minority Groups*

Vera R. Russell

It was indicated in the preceding chapter that one of the problems Negroes and Puerto Ricans face in trying to avail themselves of increasing opportunities for employment is to know where these opportunities are likely to develop -- in what industries and occupations, in what areas of the state, and in what particular communities. Such information, to be useful, would have to be supplied by continuous studies of specific developments in the state's economy. However, as a background for such studies and to point up some of the dynamic aspects of the problem, a brief survey is presented here of major general trends in the New York State economy which have a bearing on employment problems of the minority groups. The significant trends considered here are those relating to population, industrial structure, occupational composition, and sources of employment.

I. SOME GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS

Certain general characteristics of New York State affect its economic structure and probable development, and must be kept in mind in analyzing employment opportunities. In the first place, there is a recognized though unofficial demarcation between the New York metropolitan area[1] and upstate. Many other states have large central cities, but New York City is so much larger than any other city in the country (and the New York-Northeastern New Jersey Standard Metropolitan Area is so much more heavily populated than any of the 167 other such areas) that it has come to have some characteristics which set it off not only from the rest of the state but also from other large metropolitan centers. New York City, for example, serves a national rather than a local or regional market, carries on foreign trade activities related to the Port of New York and to diversified wholesale operations, has a concentration of business management headquarters and related services including finance, is the center of the "fashion industries," and exercises leadership in the theater and other arts. The economy of the four suburban counties which are within the New York metropolitan area is interrelated with that of the central city and other suburban areas in adjoining states.

---

*This chapter was written before the onset of the 1957-58 recession. There is, however, no reason to believe that the basic trends which it analyzes have been significantly affected thereby - Eds.

Furthermore the upstate region, which often appears dwarfed statistically when compared with the colossus at its southeast tip, is large enough in area, population, and industrial strength to outrank many other states. With six standard metropolitan areas and hundreds of small trading centers serving rural farm or resort regions, the economy of upstate New York bears a close resemblance to that of the country as a whole. This fact is often obscured by the use of statistical measures covering the entire state and thus heavily weighted by the influence of New York City and its environs.

New York State's great size, when measured by most economic indicators (population, income, industrial output, retail sales, and so forth), means that care must be exercised in making growth comparisons with other states in the form of percentage changes. For example, average employment in nonagricultural establishments expanded from 1950 to 1955 by 14 percent in North Carolina and by only 5 percent in New York, but the absolute expansion was 125,500 in the former and 288,200 (or more than twiceas much) in the latter.[2]

---

[1] Throughout this chapter the term "New York metropolitan area" is used to denote the five counties of New York City plus the four suburban counties of Westchester, Rockland, Nassau, and Suffolk -- that is, the New York State portion of the New York-Northeastern New Jersey Standard Metropolitan Area (SMA). The term "upstate" is used to denote the remainder of the state.

[2] U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Earnings, June 1956, p. 64.

New York State has a long history of industrial and commercial activities. This characteristic cannot be overlooked if current trends are to be viewed in their correct perspective. Because New York, like some of the other northeastern states, is more "mature" industrially than other parts of the country which are in process of shifting from an agricultural to a manufacturing economy, its rate of growth has slowed. However, the nature of the economy is constantly changing, and its magnitude is enlarging as long-established industries modernize their plant and equipment and diversify their lines by adding new products. At the same time, new industries are moving into the state, sometimes replacing those which may have moved to other areas (e.g., parts of the textile industry) or adding to the state's industrial complex. Another example of readjustment in response to changed conditions is found in Manhattan's gradual shift in emphasis from manufacturing operations to those of management and related specialized services.

II. POPULATION DISTRIBUTION AND GROWTH PATTERN

The distribution and growth pattern of the state's population are also important factors in the analysis of employment problems of minority groups. The distribution of the total population of the state is lopsided, and that of the nonwhite population is even more so. The growth pattern is also lopsided and influenced in a marked degree by a shift from immigration to natural increase and to in-migration of Negroes and Puerto Ricans.

Distribution

The lopsided distribution of the state's population is reflected in the fact that the New York metropolitan area, consisting of New York City and its four suburban counties in New York State and occupying only 4.5 percent of the state's land area, accounted in 1950 for 64 percent of the state's population. In July 1957 the non-institutional population of the state was estimated at 16.3 million, of whom 10.5 million were living in the New York metropolitan area, 3.2 million in upstate metropolitan areas, and 2.6 million in nonmetropolitan areas.[3]

---

[3] The estimated population in 1957 of the upstate SMA's was as follows: Buffalo (Erie and Niagara Counties), 1,227,000; Albany-Schenectady-Troy (Albany, Schenectady, and Rensselaer Counties), 568,000; Rochester (Monroe County), 540,000; Syracuse (Onondaga County), 395,000; Utica-Rome (Oneida and Herkimer Counties), 300,000; and Binghamton (Broome County), 203,000. The estimates are in New York State Department of Health, Monthly Vital Statistics Review, Dec. 1957, Table 1.

Distribution of nonwhites. The uneven distribution of the nonwhite inhabitants of the state (over 96% of whom are Negroes) is shown by the fact that about 981,000 of the state's 1,260,000 nonwhites (about 78%) were living in New York City in 1957 -- 32 percent in Manhattan alone -- and another 9 percent were in the four suburban counties of the New York metropolitan area. Outside the New York metropolitan area, 6 percent of the nonwhites were in the Buffalo SMA, and another one percent each in the Albany-Schenectady-Troy and Rochester SMA's. Outside of the 981,000 New York City nonwhite community, and the 62,000 nonwhite Buffalo community, there are few sizable nonwhite groups in the cities of New York. In 1957 Rochester and Mt. Vernon had 15,000 and 12,000 nonwhites respectively; New Rochelle, Syracuse and Albany each had from 9000 to 10,000; and Niagara Falls, White Plains, Yonkers and Lackawanna had from 5000 to 6000.[4]

Growth Pattern

Basic changes have occurred in recent years both in the rate of growth of the state's population and in the relative importance of the different factors of its growth. During the first half of the twentieth century, the population of New York State doubled, paralleling the growth in the United States. More recently the rate for the state has slackened somewhat. The estimated gain from 1950 to 1956 was 10.9 percent for the country as a whole, but only 9.2 percent for the state.[5] However, New York's population base is so large that even this declining gain has meant a rise of more than 1.25 million persons in each decade of this century with the exception of the depression years 1930-40. With three years of the present decade still to go, an estimated 1.63 million have been added since the Census of 1950.

Historically, a basic factor in New York's growth was the number of immigrants from Europe. During recent decades, however, this factor has greatly diminished in importance. Largely as a result of restrictions on immigration, the proportion of foreign-born persons in the state's total population fell from 30 percent in 1910 to 17 percent in 1950. During the same period, the comparable percentage for the United States dropped from 15 to 7. Still, the number of inhabitants of foreign birth in New York State in 1950 was 2,577,000 and another 4.3 million, or 29 percent of the total state population in 1950, were native white of foreign or mixed parentage.[6]

---

[4] By counties, the estimated figures in 1957 were as follows: in Manhattan, 22 percent of the total population was nonwhite; in Brooklyn, 12; in the Bronx, 10; in Westchester, Queens and Erie (Buffalo), 7; in Rockland and Suffolk, 5. These data are taken from the U. S. Census Current Population Reports, Series P-28, No. 1055 and estimates of the Division of Research, New York State Commission Against Discrimination.

[5] U. S. Bureau of Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-25, No. 148.

Another growth factor of New York State has been its drawing power within the nation, since it's diversified metropolitan areas (especially New York City) have long demanded a wide range of creative and industrial skills and provided work opportunities which were lacking in more sparsely settled areas. In 1950 New York State was the birthplace of only 66 out of every 100 of its residents; of the remaining 34 percent, 17 were born in foreign countries, 13 in other sections of the United States, and the rest in territories or possessions of the United States or to American parents abroad. Of every 100 New York residents born in other states, 21 hailed from Pennsylvania, 11 from New Jersey, and 16 from New England.[7] New York's power of attraction may have been modified in recent years by the competitive pull of areas with more temperate climates (the Pacific, the Southwest and Florida) and those in process of industrialization, such as the South, but it is hard to assess the extent to which this may have taken place.

Since 1940, in contrast to developments before that date, natural increase has played a more important role than net migration in the expansion of the state's population. From 1940 to 1950 New York gained some 1,077,000 inhabitants through the former and 274,000 from the latter. Since 1950 the annual rate of natural increase has averaged around 10 per 1000 population, a rate equal to that of the first decade of this century, as compared with 2.8 per 1000 in the period 1936-40.[8]

Growth of nonwhite and Puerto Rican population. While only 13 percent of the total population of the state were born in other states, fully 62 percent (516,750) of the nonwhites in 1950 migrated to New York from their birthplace elsewhere in the country. Of these 516,750 nonwhite state residents, 458,585, or 89 percent, were born in the South.[9] In addition, almost 200,000 New Yorkers had come from Puerto Rico. Since 1940 nonwhites and Puerto Ricans have comprised an increasing proportion of the population. In that year, nonwhites constituted 4.4 percent of the state population, and Puerto Ricans only .6 percent; in 1950, the figures were 6.5 and 1.7; by 1957, it is estimated that these two minority groups constitute 7.7 and 3.7 percent, respectively, of the population. The overwhelming majority of both groups are in New York City. While in 1940 Negroes and Puerto Ricans comprised 6.4 and 1.1 percent of the city population, the figures had risen by 1950 to 9.8 and 3.1 percent, and to 12.6 and 7.6 percent in 1957.[10]

---

[6] New York State Department of Commerce, New York State Commerce Review, (hereafter, Commerce Review) October 1954, "Foreign-born Residents of New York State," p. 4.

[7] Commerce Review, July 1954, "Interstate Population Movements," p. 9.

[8] Commerce Review, Aug. 1955, "Market Impact of Population Increase in New York State," p. 5.

Both the patterns of distribution and of growth of New York State's population are being increasingly affected by certain internal developments, the most notable of which are the shift to the suburbs and the opening up of new industrial centers.

Movement to Suburbs

While all of the economic areas of the state have shared in the recent growth of population, the largest gains have accrued to the suburban sections of standard metropolitan areas. The New York State section of the New York-Northeastern New Jersey SMA had a net increase of 813,000 inhabitants from 1950 to 1957. This net increase, however, was entirely in the suburbs: New York City lost 96,000 people, while the four suburban counties gained 909,000. The largest numerical gains were made in the counties which already were among the most populous in 1950: Nassau, up 505,000; Suffolk, 253,000; Westchester, 127,000; Erie, 107,000; Monroe, 80,000; Onondaga, 53,000. These counties are all either urban-suburban or principally suburban in character.[11]

---

[9] U.S. Census of Population, 1950, Vol. IV, Special Reports, Part 4A, State of Birth, Tables 9, 16, 17.

[10] Estimates derived by the Division of Research, New York State Commission Against Discrimination, from U.S. Census data. Cf., Department of City Planning, New York City, Bulletin, Nov. 22, 1954, p. 4. It should be noted that the two groups overlap, in that about 8 percent of the Puerto Ricans are included in the nonwhite group.

[11] Idem, using U.S. Census and State Department of Health statistics (cf. fns. 4 and 5).

Many of these populous, largely suburban counties are also among those which had the greatest percentage increase from 1950 to 1957. Suffolk (up 91%) and Nassau (up 75%) were far in the lead among the state's fastest growing counties, not only in this most recent period but also for the decade 1940-50. Other counties with more than a 10 percent increase in these years were: Westchester, Dutchess, Monroe, Onondaga, Putnam, Rockland, Niagara, Tompkins, Chemung, Schenectady, Erie, and Orange. These too are counties with sizable suburban sections.

The continuing exodus to the suburbs since 1950 is further emphasized by several other figures. In a table showing the estimated population growth from 1950 to 1955, the percentage growth of the "rest of county" is almost invariably greater throughout the state than that of any of the urban centers in each county. Thus, while increases for the communities listed under Nassau County ranged from 9 percent (Lynbrook) to 38 percent (Mineola), the rest of the county increased 68 percent. During this same five-year period, population increased only by 3 percent in New York State cities of 50,000 and over, and by 10 percent in incorporated communities of 10,000-49,000, but climbed 28 percent in the rest of the state.[12]

Interracial effects. The effects on interracial relations of the movement from central cities to suburb are mixed. In a fluid social situation such as the growing suburbs reflect it is often relatively easy to institute changes from traditional living patterns. On the other hand, many suburbs have a rigid social pattern that separates groups not only according to race but also by income level and even by age and/or political and religious affiliation. While it is true that sections of a large central city also tend to be homogeneous, residents of the various localities are apt to rub shoulders frequently in the central business district and to pass through other districts often. Distances between suburbs of varying types are greater, and it is quite possible for a suburban child in some sections of the largest metropolitan areas to live for years without making outside contacts.

New Locations for Industry

Developments now under way or planned for the next few years will undoubtedly affect relative growth patterns as between various sections of the state. The completion of the New York State Thruway has given an impetus to much of the area through which it passes, and it is to be expected that other projected superhighways (the Northway, for example, planned to link Albany with the Canadian border south of Montreal) will stimulate the location of industrial plants along the route. New plants established in the Syracuse and Mid-Hudson areas were among the first to take advantage of sites near the Thruway. The latter area, which includes Putnam, Orange, Dutchess, and Ulster counties, is also influenced by the ever-widening spread of population from the New York metropolitan area. In Table IV-a are shown the Regional Plan Association's estimate of increases in population from 1955 to 1975 for the counties within relatively brief traveling time of New York City.[13]

---

[12] "Market Impact of Population Increase in New York State," pp. 6-9.

Table IV-a. Estimated Population Increases, 1955-75

	Number	Percentage
7 counties in New York State	1,460,000	56.0
9 counties in New Jersey	1,820,000	45.0
1 county in Connecticut	245,000	44.0

These figures are in sharp contrast to the estimated increase of only 350,000 persons (4 percent) for New York City during the same period.

The St. Lawrence power and seaway projects are expected to bring benefits to the state as a whole through expansion of commerce at the ports along the seaway route and through increased industrialization of the northern counties. New job opportunities will arise in the Massena area when the additional power becomes available in 1958. Reynolds Metal Company plans to build an $88 million aluminum reduction plant in the vicinity, with permanent employment of 1000 workers; and General Motors is expected to build an aluminum foundry nearby.

Effects of population trends on minority groups. To summarize: the major trends of population growth in the state indicate a continuation of the vast movement to the suburbs, continued growth of population, especially in metropolitan areas, and the development of new population centers in sections which are becoming industrialized. It is, moreover, safe to say that a substantial part of the population increase will be accounted for by the in-migration of southern Negroes and Puerto Ricans.

---

[13] Regional Plan Association, Inc., Population, Economics and Land Use Studies of the New Jersey-New York-Connecticut Metropolitan Region for the Metropolitan Rapid Transit Survey, Aug. 1, 1956.

What are the implications of these trends for the nonwhite and Puerto Rican present and future inhabitants of the state? At one extreme there is the probability that as native whites move out from central cities to the suburbs, their places will be taken by Negroes and Puerto Ricans. There are many pressures in this direction: the lower rentals in the older sections of the central cities; the existence of Negro and Puerto Rican communities there; housing restrictions elsewhere, and the like. At the other extreme, it is conceivable that many members of these minorities will be motivated to move, and assisted in moving, to the suburbs and newly developing areas with the opening of new employment opportunities and the aid of state laws against discrimination in housing.

There is little doubt that, in the long run, hopes for substantial mobility of Negroes and Puerto Ricans lie in their movement to the outer part of Nassau and to Suffolk Counties, to the mid-Hudson area, to the Syracuse, Rochester, and Buffalo-Niagara Falls areas.[14] These communities will have the greatest opportunities for employment on all levels; they will require the engineers and the construction workers, skilled technicians as well as artisans and service workers, to meet the needs of the rapidly expanding populations. It may well be that the decisive factor in the movement or nonmovement of minorities to these areas will be the availability of housing at relatively low rentals or purchase price. At the same time, not all occupational groups will be equally in demand. Without an adequate training program, little movement of minorities will take place. Finally, one cannot expect any substantial geographic "pioneering" by Negroes and Puerto Ricans. In this respect, the existence of a number of Negro communities of several thousand in these areas provides a base for expansion. This does not hold for Puerto Ricans.

---

[14] No sizable population growth is to be anticipated at present along the Seaway, except in the Buffalo-Niagara Falls and Rochester areas. No New York port along the Seaway is yet equipped sufficiently to indicate such growth. Moreover, except for industries very dependent on power or on use of bulk raw materials, nearness to the New York City market and access to the Thruway are among the most important location factors for new firms.

III. INDUSTRIAL GROWTH AND CHANGES

Closely related to the population movements described above are the changes taking place in the industrial structure of the state. The changes of particular importance are the continued growth of manufacturing, the increasing importance of durable goods industries, shifts in the location of some industries, and changes in the relative contribution of specific industries to the economic welfare of the state.

The Manufacturing Industries

New York has long been preeminent among the states in manufacturing. In 1954, the year of the most recent United States Census of Manufactures, this state was the leader in the number of establishments, volume of employment, size of manufacturing payrolls, and value added by manufacture. At the same time New York's economy is less dependent upon manufacturing than that of any of the other leading industrial states. The percentages of total resident employed persons engaged in this field in 1950 varies as follows: Michigan, 41; New Jersey, 38; Massachusetts, 37; Ohio, 37; Pennsylvania, 36; Illinois, 32; and New York, 30. Rhode Island and Connecticut were the most highly industrialized states, according to this measure, with manufacturing engaging 44 and 43 percent respectively of their employed residents. (The comparable figure for the United States was 26.)[15]

The geographic distribution of the manufacturing industries in the state shows a high concentration in New York City and in a number of upstate counties. Almost one out of every two manufacturing employees in the state worked in New York City in 1954. Of the 954,000 such workers in the city's plants, 528,000 were in Manhattan, 236,000 in Brooklyn, 126,000 in Queens, 53,000 in the Bronx, and 11,000 in Richmond. Factories in the four suburban counties of the New York metropolitan area employed another 175,000. Upstate counties with employment in this field of 20,000 or more are shown in Table IV-b.

New York's industrial economy is both diversified and specialized. Its diversification is illustrated in the wide range of commodities produced. Of the 453 types of manufacturing industries classified by the Bureau of the Census, 430 are found in New York, a larger number than in any other

---

[15] U. S. Census of Population, 1950, Vol. II, P-B1, U. S. Summary: General Characteristics, p. 135.

Table IV-b. Upstate Counties with Manufacturing Employment of 24,000 or More

Erie	148,000	Broome	41,000
Monroe	111,000	Schenectady	36,000
Onondaga	58,000	Oneida	31,000
Niagara	51,000	Dutchess	24,000

state.[16] This is possible only because of the great variety of skills and occupations represented in the labor supply.

The industrial specialization of the state is shown in the fact that 380,000 workers (20% of all manufacturing personnel) were employed in apparel production in 1954.[17] The next most important manufacturing industries in terms of employment were printing and publishing, with 171,000; the miscellaneous group (which includes makers of jewelry, silverware, musical instruments, toys, buttons, brooms, candles, advertising displays, umbrellas, ordnance, and other products), 167,000; food and related products, 151,000; machinery (except electrical), 149,000; transportation equipment, 142,000; and electrical machinery, 126,000. These seven branches of production together engage 67 percent of the manufacturing workers and contribute 66 percent of the value added by manufacture in the state.

The industrial structure of New York State's manufacturing economy was in marked contrast to that of the United States as a whole. Thus the apparel group ranked first in employment in the state, but was in fourth place nationally. The three groups which held second, third, and seventh place in New York-- printing and publishing, miscellaneous, and electrical machinery -- were excluded from the top seven in the country. On the other hand, primary metals, fabricated metals, and textiles qualified for the top seven in the United States but not in New York, and the food, nonelectrical machinery, and transportation equipment industries were relatively more important in the country as a whole than in this state.

---

[16] New York State Department of Commerce, Business Facts, New York State, 1952, p. 4.

[17] Commerce Review, August 1956, "Seven Years of Change in New York's Manufacturing," pp. 6-7.

New York State's specialization in the industries listed above, especially in the apparel, printing and publishing, and miscellaneous groups, stems largely from the character of production in the New York metropolitan area. The teeming city with its millions of consumers affords an almost insatiable market for nondurable goods. Besides, the city's firms have not been content with serving local demand alone, since their location is an ideal one for tapping the national and international markets. The area also has a sizable volume of employment in virtually every one of the major industry groups, with special emphasis on food products, electrical machinery, transportation equipment (chiefly aircraft and parts), and chemicals, in addition to those already mentioned.

In upstate New York the pattern of manufacturing is closer to the national average than is that of New York City and its environs. The Buffalo SMA accounts for almost half of the state's primary metals industry, nearly one-quarter of chemicals production, and more than 10 percent of both the food and the electrical machinery industries (all based on employment). The Rochester SMA, widely renowned for its quality cameras, scientific instruments, and men's clothing, engaged more than 50 percent of all employees in the state's instruments industry. The Syracuse SMA is noted for its diversity; factories there turn out such varied products as tool steel, china, chemicals, and many types of machinery. The electrical machinery industry in the Albany-Schenectady-Troy SMA supplies a worldwide market with motors, generators, and other products; transportation equipment (locomotives), nonelectrical machinery, and apparel are other important products of this region. Metals, both primary and fabricated, and nonelectrical machinery are the principal products of the Utica-Rome SMA, while Binghamton specializes in leather shoes, business machines, and photographic equipment.

Growth patterns in manufacturing. Value added by manufacture in New York State establishments rose from almost $9.656 billion in 1947 to $14.141 billion in 1954, or 46 percent. Some of this gain is traceable to price increases. The following excerpt summarizes the changes in this period:

> The balance of the expansion in production can be attributed to (1) the output of the hundreds of new plants added in the seven years to the State's manufacturing capacity; (2) the goods turned out in the expanded facilities of many existing factories; and

(3) an advance in productivity of older plants through the installation of improved tools and techniques. It may be noted that the census for 1954 was taken in a recessionary year; if it had been taken in 1953 or 1955, increases from 1947 would have been even larger.

New York's manufacturing employment between 1947 and 1954 rose from 1,773,000 to *1,896,000*. This gain of *6.9* percent compares well with figures for many other leading industrial states. In Indiana, New Jersey and Ohio increases were under seven percent, while in Illinois, Massachusetts and Pennsylvania there were declines. In California, however, the increase was around 55 percent. These figures exclude personnel working in central administrative offices and auxiliary units of manufacturers (warehouses, garages, research laboratories, repair shops, power plants, etc.). If such personnel are included, the 1954 total for this State becomes *2,008,000*. New York's *112,000* administrative and auxiliary personnel comprise nearly one-quarter of all such manufacturing workers in the country (464,000).[18]

A significant development in recent years has been the increasing importance of durable goods industries in the state's economy. This trend, apparent between the years 1939 and 1947, was again evident in the 1947-54 period. In the latter span, New York's manufactures of durable goods showed an 83 percent gain in value added, well ahead of the comparable 74 percent increase nationally. The impetus for durables has been threefold: (1) a vast increase in defense spending on aircraft, electronics, warships, ordnance, and other heavy military material after an immediate post-World War II lull; (2) a large rise in demand for metals, machinery, and other equipment to meet the capital expansion programs of almost all businesses in the decade following the war; (3) a shift on the part of the consumer away from purchases of apparel and some other soft goods -- related to the widespread adoption of a more casual, "suburban" approach to living -- together with a rise in buying of such consumer durables as automobiles, home appliances, and allied products. As a consequence of these changes in demand, New York State's manufacturing economy has come closer to a balance between its durable and its non-durable goods industries.[19]

---

[18] *Commerce Review*, Aug. 1956, p. 1. The article quoted carried preliminary figures from the Census of Manufactures. The final figures have appeared and are here given in italics.

A more detailed list of the industries which grew substantially in New York State in the period 1947-54 is given in the 1954 Census of Manufactures. These industries may be roughly classified as follows, although the classes are by no means mutually exclusive:

> 1. Industries which have been stimulated by the generally high levels of employment and personal income throughout the United States during most of the postwar period. The high level of residential building, especially of single-family houses, has stimulated the growth of such industries as millwork, concrete and gypsum products, metal household furniture, curtains and draperies, house-furnishings, and electric appliances. The large volume of consumer spending power channeled into the purchase of automobiles brought expansion in this state in industries producing motor vehicles and parts, and rubber. Also, higher family incomes have made it possible for housewives to save time in food preparation by purchasing more prepared foods, stimulating industries turning out flour mixes and food preparations.
>
> While "time-saving industries" have expanded, another group of growing industries is engaged in making products which help to provide entertainment and instruction for the increased leisure resulting from the shorter work-week and paid vacations now enjoyed by many workers, e.g., book printing, periodical and newspaper publishing, and the radio- and TV-set industry.
>
> 2. Industries which have expanded because of the postwar baby boom, e.g., knit outerwear mills, children's dresses and outerwear, dolls, and games and toys.

---

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 3.

> 3. Industries which have come into being or expanded through the development of relatively new products or techniques (including automation): plastics and elastomers, plastic products, pharmaceuticals, and computing machines.
>
> 4. Industries which have been affected by the varied demands arising from the defense program as well as from enlarged consumer and producer markets throughout the country since 1947. Such are primary metals, structural work, metal doors, general industrial machinery, machine shops, electric motors and generators, aircraft, and electrical measuring instruments.

These are the industries in which job opportunities were greatest during the seven-year period under review. Many of these industries will continue to grow as long as generally prosperous conditions persist. However, opportunities should not be overlooked for employment in the more stable industries in which the average age of employees is relatively high and there is need for annual replacement as workers retire.

In times of serious recession, those sectors of manufacturing that produce durable goods (both producer and consumer) are usually the first to feel the impact. New York's vulnerability in this respect is inevitably increasing owing to the developments described above. However, the economy of the state is probably still less vulnerable than that of the rest of the United States, because here there is still a greater emphasis on nondurable goods production.

The probable effects of automation on employment opportunities are not easy to assess at this time because experience is so limited. The manufacture of the complicated equipment required for fully automated systems and parts for replacement would mean employment of large numbers of skilled and semiskilled workers. The operation and maintenance of such equipment would enlarge the demand for highly trained engineers and technicians. It is probable that a highly automated economy would mean, along with a shorter work-week, concentration of employment in the highly skilled and relatively unskilled occupations, with fewer opportunities than today for semiskilled workers.

Nonmanufacturing Industries[20]

The importance of trade and service industries in New York State's economic life has already been indicated. Such activities stem from the state's strategic location on both the Atlantic Coast and the Great Lakes, the large consumer market for goods and services demanded by residents as well as visitors from thickly populated nearby states and farther afield, and the widely diversified industrial market comprised of thousands of manufacturing firms in the northeastern states and central Canada.

Changes in census coverage, definitions, classifications, and techniques in recent years make it more difficult to pinpoint trends in these industries than in manufacturing, but certain developments are apparent.

In the first place, retail sales in New York State, as in the rest of the country, expanded greatly from 1948 to 1954 in response to widespread demands made effective by relatively high levels of income. At the same time the number of retail establishments declined from 186,000 to 183,400 and there was little if any increase in employment. It is clear that the lesser number of retail stores resulted from the demise of small establishments with no paid employees, since the number of units with payroll actually rose by more than 2500. The great number of new supermarkets goes far to explain this development. The application of self-service principles in such stores and to a lesser degree in many other kinds of business helps to account for the retailers' ability to increase sales with a given number of personnel. However, trade sources tend to emphasize job opportunities in the retail field. With a constantly increasing population, retailers are finding it difficult to recruit efficient sales people in an economy which has virtually full employment.

Second, in the service trades covered by the Census, business services showed substantial growth in New York State from 1947 to 1954, whereas personal and other types of service trades (automobile repair services and garages, miscellaneous repair services, amusement and recreational services and hotels), as groups, did little more than keep pace with the increase in population.[21] Business services such as advertising agencies, duplicating and addressing services, blueprinting and photocopying services, detective agencies, telephone answering services, window cleaning, and window display are found principally in central cities. New York City in particular is the locale of a phenomenal variety of highly specialized firms providing aids to the business community.

---

[20] For more detail on recent developments in these industries in New York, see Commerce Review, Feb. 1956 (retailing), July 1956 (wholesale) and Feb. 1957 (service trades).

Paid employees and proprietors of unincorporated businesses in New York's service trades numbered 457,000 in 1954. The miscellaneous repair services may be noted as comprising a group of trades characteristically dominated by small business. An individual with the necessary mechanical skill can establish himself in one of these lines with a minimum of capital. In the state's watch, clock, and jewelry repair trade proprietors out-numbered paid employees by almost three to one in 1954. The two types of personnel were evenly divided in the following trades: upholstery and furniture repair, radio-television repair, and lawnmower, saw, knife, and tool sharpening and repair. Radio-television repair services expanded markedly from 1948 to 1954; in the latter year this trade accounted for more than one out of every five proprietors of unincorporated businesses in the miscellaneous repair services group.

IV. CHANGES IN OCCUPATIONAL COMPOSITION

The Pattern of Occupations

The growth and shifts in the industrial structure of New York State have been accompanied by changes in the occupational characteristics of its working population as shown in Table IV-c.

Employed persons living in New York State in 1950 numbered 5,944,000, or 20 percent more than a decade earlier. This rise is in good measure attributable to the greater percentage of women now employed. All nonfarm occupational groups had more workers in 1950 than in 1940, except service workers in private households and male

---

[21] It should be noted, however, that the number of males in the occupation of automobile mechanics rose by 17,000 or about 47 percent. The much larger increase in the occupational category than in the industrial may be explained by the growing tendency for such repair work to be handled by mechanics in establishments classified as automotive dealers or gasoline service stations, or in the repair shops maintained for their own use by firms owning fleets of cars or trucks.

Table IV-c. Occupation of Employed Persons 14 Years and Over, by Sex,[a] New York State: 1940 & 1950 (in thousands)

Occupation	Male			Female		
	1940	1950	% change[b] 1940-50	1940	1950	% change[b] 1940-50
Total	3,496	4,098	17.2	1,453	1,845	26.9
Professional, technical, kindred	305	400	31.0	193	229	19.2
Farmers, farm managers	117	94	-19.2	4	3	- 7.8
Managers, officials, proprietors, nonfarm	428	572	33.6	46	76	67.1
Clerical, kindred	328	385	17.5	392	596	52.1
Sales	324	317	- 2.4	98	125	27.3
Craftsmen, foremen, kindred	610	782	28.1	19	33	71.6
Operatives, kindred	659	808	22.7	308	425	38.2
Private household	16	9	-42.1	213	131	-38.4
Service, except private household	347	369	6.4	147	180	22.2
Farm laborers and foremen	82	56	-31.0	3	9	254.5
Laborers, except farm and mine	250	262	4.8	9	10	11.2
Occupation not reported	32	44	39.7	23	26	14.8

[a] 1940 and 1950 occupational data by race are given in Table 17, Appendix A.

[b] Percentages calculated using the complete figures, not the rounded figures given here.

Source: U.S. Census of Population, 1950, Vol. II, P-C32, New York: Detailed Characteristics, Table 74.

sales workers. The largest single occupational group among males consisted of semiskilled operatives; this group has almost been overtaken by the skilled craftsmen and foremen group (respectively 19.7 and 19.1% of total male employed). Among female workers, almost one-third are employed in clerical occupations, another 7 percent are salesworkers, and 23 percent are operatives.

Occupations of Negroes and whites compared. The high concentration of employment in the clerical and sales group in New York State is in good part confined to the category of white female workers. This group accounted for 42 percent of all white female workers, as compared with 17 percent of the white males, 12 percent of the Negro males, and 10 percent of the Negro female workers. The only other categories which had substantial numbers of white females were operatives (22%), professional and technical (13%), and nonprivate household service (9%).

In contrast, service in private household and operatives were the leading occupations by far for Negro female workers in 1950, with 36 and 31 percent respectively; service (except private household) followed with 14 percent; then clerical and sales, 10 percent; and professional and technical, 5 percent. No other occupational group accounted for as much as 2 percent of the Negro female workers.

In the distribution of white male workers two occupations vied for first place: craftsmen and foremen, 19.6 percent, and operatives, 19.4 percent. Negro male workers, on the other hand, had only 11 percent in the category of skilled craftsmen and foremen, while the leading category was semiskilled operatives, with 26 percent. Three other occupational groups had substantial percentages of the white male workers: clerical and sales, 17; managers, and so forth (except farm), 14; and professional and technical, 10. The three corresponding percentages for Negro male workers in these higher occupational groups were 12, 5, and 3.[22] In addition to the operatives, they were concentrated in nonprivate household service (23%) and in the category of laborers exclusive of farm and mine workers (16%).

If we make a gross dividing line between upper and lower status (and paying) occupations, including professionals, proprietors, managers, officials, clerical and sales workers, and craftsmen, foremen, and kindred in the upper group, the following picture emerges: In 1950 almost two-thirds (64%) of all white male workers were in the upper group, in contrast to 31 percent of all Negro male workers. The corresponding figures for white and Negro females were 62 and 17 percent, respectively.

---

[22] The relatively (and absolutely) poor showing of Negro male, as compared with Negro female, employees in the professional and technical occupations is probably explained by opportunities for Negro women in the nursing and teaching fields.

The difference between Negroes and whites can also be viewed from another angle. Negro females constituted 9.2 percent of all female workers in 1950, but only 2.7 percent of female workers in the upper-status categories. In the same year Negro males made up 5.1 percent of all male workers, but only 2.5 percent of male workers in the upper-status categories. (See Table 17 in Appendix A for detailed statistics and sources.)

Because of the heavy concentration of the Negro population in New York City, percentages showing the occupational distribution of nonwhite employed workers are virtually the same for the city as for the state. The pattern for Puerto Rican workers in New York City is similar to that of nonwhites, but with an even greater predominance of operatives (37% of all Puerto Rican male workers, as against 25% for male nonwhite, and 77% for female Puerto Rican as compared with 31% for female nonwhite), and a smaller percentage of laborers. A real point of contrast is the low percentage of Puerto Rican female workers in private household service (2%, as against the 35% for nonwhite female workers).[23]

For the white members of the labor force, employment in the New York metropolitan area is characterized by a greater emphasis on managerial, professional and technical, service (except private household), sales, and clerical groups -- the so-called white-collar occupations -- than upstate, where the craftsmen and operatives groups are relatively more important.[24] In 1950 the percentage of total employed workers classified as operatives was especially high in the Utica-Rome and Binghamton areas, of craftsmen in the Buffalo area, of clerical workers (not including sales workers) in the Albany-Schenectady-Troy area, and of service workers in the Mid-Hudson counties with their extensive resort sections.

The Patterns of Change

As noted previously, the number of gainfully employed increased 20 percent from 1940 to 1950. This increase, however, was not evenly spread among all occupational categories. There were over one-third fewer private household workers, one-quarter fewer farm laborers, and 19 percent fewer farmers and farm managers. The proportion of clerical workers, on the other hand, led the increase; in 1950 there were 36.9 percent more workers in clerical occupations than there had been in 1940. This rise was particularly large among women, with a 52 percent increase. The number of managers, proprietors, and officials (nonfarm) followed close behind, increasing 36.6 percent. Percentage increases were also registered for craftsmen and foremen (30), operatives (27), and professional and technical workers (27). There was also an increase -- though at a lower rate than that of the total labor force -- of nonhousehold service workers (11), sales workers (5), and nonfarm laborers (2).[25]

---

[23] U. S. Census of Population, 1950, Vol. II, P-C32, New York: Detailed Characteristics, Table 36, pp. 312ff; Vol. IV, Special Reports, Part 3D, Puerto Ricans in Continental United States.

[24] Commerce Review, Jan. 1953, p. 3.

Assuming that the 1940-50 trend has continued and will continue for the coming years, the demand for labor will be greatest in clerical, managerial, skilled, semiskilled, and professional occupations, in that order.

The change for nonwhites. The shifts have had a marked impact on the nonwhite occupational distribution. In general, there was a shift toward the better-paid, higher-status occupations during the 1940-50 decade among nonwhites, both absolutely and compared to whites. This was particularly true for nonwhite females. While the proportion of white females who were clerical workers increased from 36 to 42 percent, the proportion of Negro females more than tripled (2.7 to 9.7%). The most striking change in the decade took place in the area of private household workers. Whereas in 1940 some 68 percent of Negro female workers were employed in private households, by 1950 the percentage had declined to 36. This is still far higher than the comparable percentage of white women, which declined even more sharply from 11 to 4 percent. In the professional and technical field, too, Negro women improved their position. While the proportion of white women declined slightly (from 13.8 to 13.2), the percentage of Negro women rose from 3.5 to 4.9.

Negro male workers experienced a much less marked improvement during the war decade than did Negro females. The major change occurred in the decline of the proportion engaged in services other than private household: In 1940, some 34 percent of all Negro male workers were in this category; in 1950, the percentage had dropped to 23. The comparable percentages of white males were 9.6 in 1940 and 8.1 in 1950. There were higher percentages in 1950 than in 1940 of all Negro male workers in the semiskilled (19 to 26), skilled (8 to 11), and clerical (9 to 12) categories. By contrast, the proportion of all white males who were semiskilled and clerical workers declined slightly from 1940 to 1950, but the proportion engaged in the skilled occupations increased from 17 to 20 percent.

---

[25] U. S. Census of Population, 1950, Vol. II, P-B32, New York: General Characteristics, Table 29, p. 68. For a more detailed discussion of trends in specific occupations, see Charles M. Armstrong, Industrial and Occupational Trends in New York State, Albany: The State Education Department, 1954, pp. 12-15.

Using the same gross breakdown as above between upper- and lower-status occupational categories, the decade witnessed an upward movement in all four groups considered here (see Table IV-d).

Table IV-d. Percentage in Upper-Status Occupational Categories[a]

	1940	1950
Of all Negro female workers	7	17
Of all Negro male workers	25	31
Of all white female workers	55	62
Of all white male workers	60	64

[a] Professionals; proprietors, managers, officials; clerical and sales; and craftsmen and foremen.

Although these figures show a sharper improvement for Negroes than for whites, the figures should be taken with caution: Negro workers have so much more room for improvement in occupation status than do whites that percentage improvements are deceptive. As indicated above, even in 1950 a substantial differential existed.

V. CHANGING SOURCES OF EMPLOYMENT

Employment in Industries by Areas

Every industry in the state, except personal services and agriculture, showed increased employment from 1940 to 1950. Gains were especially great in manufacturing, where the average number of workers rose from 1,357,000 to 1,773,000. More people were attached to the manufacturing industry in 1950 than to any other in New York State. This industry's share of the employed was 30 percent in 1950, as compared with 27 percent in 1940. The defense program accounted in part for this increased emphasis on production of goods rather than services. Manufacturing was also the most important industry in 1950 in point of numbers employed in each area of the state except the Nassau-Suffolk, Westchester-Rockland, Mid-Hudson, and Northern areas. The most spectacular gain over the period was made by the Nassau-Suffolk District, where expansion based on World War II contracts was continued with the defense program and further stimulated by the large-scale movement of population into the area.

The proportion of manufacturing workers to total employed persons in 1950 was considerably higher upstate than in the New York metropolitan area -- 35 and 27 percent respectively. Areas where the concentration was greater than the upstate average were the Mohawk Valley, Buffalo, and Rochester. (It should be noted that not all of the 1,209,000 men and 564,000 women residents of the state employed in manufacturing were production workers; many were occupied in executive, managerial, selling, research, promotion, or clerical work in head offices and laboratories of large corporations.)

Second in importance among the state's industries in 1950 were the services, which employed 830,000 men and 650,000 women, or 25 percent of the total employed. Although this was somewhat below the 27 percent recorded in 1940, the long-run trend seems to be in the direction of more -- and more varied -- services, and this state is in the vanguard of that development. While the emphasis on service industries was especially pronounced in the New York metropolitan area (26% of total employed), the share of this group in the employment total for the upstate region (22%) was slightly higher than the national figure. Westchester and Rockland counties, with a combined concentration in this field of 32 percent, had the highest percentage in the state, while the Mid-Hudson area's 27 percent and Northern New York's 25 percent topped the list upstate.

Specialization in the various kinds of services differed considerably from one area to another. Professional services, the largest of the subgroups in 1950, accounted for more than half a million of the state's workers, and of these 224,000 were engaged in medical and health services. Concentration of service workers in professional fields was especially high in the following areas: Westchester-Rockland (14% of all employed), Mid-Hudson (12), Elmira (12), Northern (11), Nassau-Suffolk (11). Personal services are subdivided by the Bureau of the Census into private households, hotels, and other lodging places, and other (including barbers, beauty shops, laundries, and so forth). Three out of each 100 employed persons in New York State worked in private households, with much heavier concentrations in the Westchester-Rockland and Nassau-Suffolk districts. Throughout the state, hotels employed less than half as many workers as private households did, but were especially important in the Mid-Hudson and Northern areas.

The third largest source of employment among New York State's industries in 1950 was retail trade, which engaged 663,000 men and 289,000 women, or 16 percent of all employed persons. Concentration of employment in this industry was greater in the New York metropolitan area (17%), and especially in New York City, than upstate (15%).

Transportation, communications, and public utilities in the state required the services of more than half a million persons in 1950 -- 436,000 men and 86,000 women. These workers were 9.4 percent of all employed persons living in the New York metropolitan area and 7.6 percent of those in the rest of the state. In the upstate region relatively heavy concentrations of railroad and railway express employees were reported for the Elmira, Albany-Schenectady-Troy, and Buffalo areas; for communications in Albany-Schenectady-Troy; for utilities and sanitary services in the Buffalo, Mid-Hudson, and Rochester areas; and for trucking service and warehousing in the Syracuse and Buffalo areas.

The 210,000 men and 127,000 women employed in finance, insurance, and real estate comprised 6 percent of all employed persons in the state. The relative importance of this segment of the economy was understandably much greater in the New York metropolitan area, where it accounted for 7.2 percent of all workers, than upstate, where only 2.7 percent were in this field.

Construction occupied 5 percent (300,000 men and 10,000 women) of the state's work force in 1950, a proportion which was fairly uniform throughout, except for the Nassau-Suffolk, Mid-Hudson,[26] and Westchester-Rockland areas, with percentages of 10, 9, and 7 respectively.

In New York City, where so much wholesale trade is on a national scale, 6 out of each 100 employed persons worked in this field, whereas the average for all upstate areas combined was 3 out of every 100.[27]

---

[26] The relatively high percentage for this area in 1950 may be explained largely by the extensive operations on the Delaware Valley extension of the New York City water supply system.

[27] Commerce Review, Jan. 1953, pp. 6-7. Cf., New York State Department of Commerce, Business Facts, New York State, 1954 Supplement, 1954, pp. 10-13, for detailed information on cities and economic areas in the state.

Changes in Industrial Employment

The relative importance of the various manufacturing industries in New York State is changing. In general, the durable goods industries, such as metal working, are expanding, while the consumer goods industries, such as food and kindred products, textile mill products, and apparel, are either decreasing or making a slow growth. In the apparel trades there has been increased employment over-all, but decreased employment of men with the increase entirely among females. An exception to the increasing trends in the metal working industries is found in ship and boat building and repairing, which has shown a decrease in employment. Among manufacturing industries other than the metals which have made a rapid growth are paper and allied products and chemical and allied products.

Transportation, communications, and other public utilities expanded in employment from 1940 to 1950 by about 28 percent. The air transport industry created fewer jobs over the decade than the railroads. The street railway and bus lines had a bigger increase in employment than the railroads. Water transportation created almost as many new jobs as the air transportation industry. The telephone industry, which has been introducing amazing mechanical and electronic devices to save labor, still increased employment by more than 35,000. On the other hand, the power and light industry, with a large expansion in plant capacity, had an insignificant increase in employees.

Wholesale and retail trade increased by 258,000 or 26 percent. Of this, 138,000, or considerably over half, occurred in wholesale trade. Of the 120,000 increase in retail trade a large proportion was concentrated in a small number of industries, such as eating and drinking establishments, general merchandise stores, and household appliance and radio stores. In general, these figures reflect the increased efficiency in retailing. A much larger volume of goods is being sold now than in 1940, but the increase in employment in retail trade has been moderate. As we have seen, part of the increased efficiency is the result of the extension of the self-service idea and quantity buying of food and other articles in large stores. In 1930 many housewives shopped every day or two. Now many shop once a week. The shortage of labor has also squeezed this industry which has had a reputation for low pay.

Finance, insurance, and real estate grew substantially over the ten-year period 1940-50 even though the men employed decreased by more than 6000. The increase of more than 44,000 among the women far overshadowed the decrease in men. The increases were concentrated in the banking and insurance fields. Real estate office employment decreased.

Business and repair services increased by 42 percent. Advertising; accounting, auditing, and bookkeeping services; miscellaneous business services; and miscellaneous repair services all showed increases of 10,000 or more in employment, but automobile repair services and garages had an increase of less than 6000, or 10 percent.[28]

Public administration was another area of considerable expansion, amounting to 85,100, or 46 percent. This classification includes the postal service, federal, state, and local public administration. It does not include the Army and Navy, the public schools, or the public hospitals.[29]

Unpublished figures of the New York State Department of Labor, Division of Employment, indicate a general continuity in the above trends after 1950, as shown in Table IV-e.

The outstanding trend shown here is the movement from nondurable to durable goods production within manufacturing. Also worth noting is the rise in the proportion of total employed engaged by government, and the continued decline of the utilities field. The other industries have remained fairly stable since 1950 in their proportions of total employed.

Employment of Nonwhites

Industries in which the concentration of Negro male workers was relatively greater than that of white males include transportation, communication, and other public utilities (15% of the Negro males and 10% of the white males); finance, insurance, and real estate (7 and 5%); business and repair services (4.2 and 3.5%); personal services (9 and 3%); and public administration (6 and 5%). Manufacturing industries engaged around 30 percent of all white male workers and 24 percent of Negro males; similar percentages for wholesale and retail trade were 22 for white males and 17 for Negro males.

A much greater contrast in industrial distribution according to color for female than for male workers follows logically from the discussion of occupational patterns. While manufacturing accounted for 31 percent of all employed white women and 26 percent of Negro female workers,

---

[28] See footnote 21.

[29] The description of changes in the industrial sources of employment presented here is a summary of Armstrong, op. cit., pp. 12-15.

Table IV-e. Percentage Distribution of Annual Average Employment, By Industry, 1940, 1950, and 1955

Industry	1940	1950	1955
Manufacturing	32.0	32.5	32.3
Durable goods	[a]	12.3	14.0
Nondurable goods	[a]	20.3	18.3
Retail trade	22.3[b]	14.2	13.9
Service	12.7	13.6	13.7
Government	11.4	11.7	12.3
Transportation and public utilities	9.6	8.8	8.3
Wholesale trade	[b]	8.0	8.0
Finance, insurance & real estate	8.5	7.0	7.3
Contract construction	3.3	4.1	4.0
Extractive	[a]	0.2	0.2

[a] Not available.

[b] In the 1940 Census, Wholesale and Retail Trade were listed as one.

the former had a much stronger representation in wholesale and retail trade (20% as against 7%), professional and related services (17% for white, 11% for Negro) and finance, insurance, and real estate (7% versus 2%), whereas the reverse was true for personal services, including private household (9% of all white female workers, 46% of employed Negro women). (See Table 12 in Appendix A for detailed statistics and sources.)

VI. CONCLUSION

New York State has many economic opportunities for its young residents who are just entering the labor market, for older residents who wish to improve their earnings, and for persons who come here to make their homes. These opportunities stem partly from the large size and great variety of existing industries in the state -- manufacturing, trade, service industries, the professions, and the arts. Because of this diversity, the range of occupation specialties required by the business community is exceptionally wide.

Another factor making for employment opportunities is the continued growth and development in most phases of the state's economic life. Population is increasing, especially in the suburban parts of the standard metropolitan areas. Manufacturing output is rising, although the nature of that output is changing somewhat in response to market demands. The substantial contraction in New York's textile industry has been more than offset by expansion in growth industries such as electronics and aircraft production. The volume of wholesale and retail trade is still growing, with the New York-Northeastern New Jersey SMA far in the lead as the prime distributive center of the country. The provision of business services is also expanding along with the current strengthening of New York City's established position as headquarters of the nation's industries.

During the next few years a relative scarcity of persons in their twenties and early thirties is anticipated because of the low birth rates of the decade and a half preceding World War II. This situation will be a significant factor in the labor market until the postwar generation begins to reach working age in the middle 1960s. If our national output continues to expand, over-all employment opportunities are likely to be attractive for the next decade. The relative shortage of younger workers may spur employers to economize on labor by increased mechanization -- a trend that has always characterized American industry. All signs point to an increasing demand for the technically trained worker in New York, as in the rest of the country.

The implications for minority groups of the trends discussed in this chapter are not easy to assess. Nonetheless a number of points seem to stand out. In terms of population distribution, increasing racial and ethnic homogeneity of our communities seems in store, with Negroes and Puerto Ricans increasingly concentrated in the central cities and becoming ever-larger segments of their populations as whites move out to suburban areas. On the other hand, the opening up of new industrial centers along the Thruway and in the Buffalo-Niagara area offers a promising opportunity for a more even population distribution.

Second, the great industrial diversification of the country's leading manufacturing state requires a great variety of skills, and augurs well for the skilled, technically trained worker. The greatest areas of industrial expansion seem to be in durable-goods industries and business services. This would seem to call for major guidance efforts in the direction of these areas, lest minority groups concentrate in fields which, offering least promise, are abandoned by whites. On the other hand, durable goods industries are most immediately vulnerable to economic recession.

Of far greater import than location in one type of industry or another is the question of occupational distribution. The field of greatest concentration of nonwhites and Puerto Ricans -- semiskilled occupations -- offers possibly least promise for the future. The greatest shortages and growth potentials exist in the skilled and clerical fields. Given a sufficiently strong motivation and adequate training facilities, the conjunction of a tight labor market and a prosperous and expanding economy offers an opportunity for the next decade to be decisive in cracking the discriminatory barriers to economic integration of minority groups.

Part Three

CASES IN POINT

Chapter V

NEGRO AND WHITE HIGH SCHOOL YOUTH IN ELMIRA[1]

Aaron Antonovsky and Melvin J. Lerner

Although discrimination and other experiences of Negro adults are crucial to their life chances, it is during childhood and adolescence that the effects of discrimination against their forebears take root and influence their skills, values, personality structure, achievement orientation, and the like. This study was designed to identify the factors which, in the young Negro's experience, affect his later life chances.

---

[1] In the fall of 1956 the Mayor's Committee on Human Relations of Elmira consulted with the Education Division of SCAD on the Committee's program. It was suggested by Mr. John Sullivan, Director of Education -- to whom the authors wish to express their appreciation for his great help throughout the study -- that a necessary antecedent to action was an investigation into the manpower potential of the community. In the course of subsequent discussions, the present study was evolved. It is to be hoped that it will prove to be of value to the Mayor's Committee as well as to the concerns of the Discrimination and Low Incomes Study.

The authors express their gratitude to the members of the Project Committee -- Mayor Edward A. Mooers; Supt. of Schools Donald S. Keeler; Mrs. Mildred S. Essick, Executive Secy. of the Mayor's Committee; Mrs. Irma C. Pratt, manager of the Elmira State Employment Service office; and Dr. Albert B. Helmkamp, Project Committee chairman -- for the extensive effort and concern with this study, the guidance and insight provided, as well as their cooperation in partly underwriting the costs of the study. We hope that our technical contribution as social researchers will assist them in the really difficult task which is theirs -- action. Appreciation is also expressed to Mr. Arno Winard for valuable assistance in tabulation and analysis of the data.

The attempt to analyze "what happens to Negro youth" can only be sound when a control group of white youth is studied simultaneously, so that comparisons can be made and emerging differences tentatively attributed to race. Since Negroes are predominantly a low-income group, in order to avoid the fallacy of confusing what might well be a socio-economic with an ethnic phenomenon our white group was selected as nearly as possible to approximate the status of the Negroes. This point cannot be overstressed: In examining this chapter the reader should constantly bear in mind that we are comparing a sample of almost all Negro youth to a sample of white youth from the poorest part of Elmira.

We were not only concerned about differences that might emerge. Similarities, we felt, would prove to be no less significant. The differences -- or those which seemed undesirable in terms of the values we hold -- should suggest programs of action designed to eliminate them. The similarities, on the other hand, are also relevant to action: Such findings, utilized in educational programs, serve to counteract negative stereotypes about Negro youth.

I. THE PROBLEMS

Our central area of inquiry was the Negro youth's view of his future, with particular stress on vocational orientation. How do these boys and girls, on the threshold of the adult community, look to their future? What plans, hopes, and expectations do they have and what are the elements of realism and fantasy in them? What influences have molded their outlook? How do they feel about specific occupations? What values and criteria of success do they have? What role does college play in their outlook? And, in all these areas, what are the similarities and differences between Negro and white boys and girls from roughly the same socio-economic background? Another concern was the relation of these youngsters to the Elmira community.

In order to explain whatever differences might appear, our study inquired into a number of questions concerning background and experience. What influence on the outlook of Negro youth does the family have? What are the effects of the birthplace, education, and occupation of parents? What is the nature of the school and previous work experience of these youth? Have they encountered discrimination? What are their aptitudes?

Our general hypothesis was that Negro youth would have aspirations and orientations that differ from those held by their white peers,[2] as a result of specific factors that often confront them, e.g., an unstable family structure, the absence of socially esteemed models with whom they can identify, the lack of personal and community contacts to enable them to get a start, the knowledge of existing discrimination, and so forth.

---

[2] See Part VIII of this chapter for reference to the findings of previous studies in this area.

One word of caution. Evaluations of vocational aspirations tend to be made in terms of the dominant values in our society: monetary success, upward movement in social status, achievement of power, satisfactory adjustment to the status quo, individual success, and conformism. These are, however, not the only possible values. We believe that an alternative set should also be considered: realization of the individual's potential capacities, security, rootedness in one's social groups and one's community, satisfaction from one's work rather than only from the rewards (money, status) it may bring. In evaluating vocational aspirations it is necessary to ask: What are the effects of the environment on the achievement of both these sets of values; for both must be considered in understanding the handicaps that Negro youngsters face.[3]

II. PROCEDURES

Sample Selection and Interviewing

The original sample consisted of 69 Negroes and 99 whites. These were selected, by use of a table of random numbers, from the students who entered the Elmira Free Academy high school in the years 1951-54, and who had attended the two junior high schools in the neighborhoods in which Elmira Negroes are concentrated, i.e., the most depressed areas in the community. Only those whites were included who resided within these areas. The Negro sample was a 100 percent sample. The two groups had the same proportion of boys to girls.

Usable interviews were completed with 61 of the 69 Negroes. One of the 8 not included was interviewed too late, 3 had moved away and could not be located, and 4 had moved away and failed to respond to the mail questionnaire sent to them.

Usable interviews were completed with 64 of the 99 whites. Two of the 35 not included were interviewed too late, 29 had moved away and could not be located, and 4 had moved away and failed to respond to the mail questionnaire sent to them.

---

[3] For a brief but excellent exposition of these alternative sets of values, see Albert K. Cohen, Delinquent Boys, Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1955, Chapter 4.

While the small number of Negroes who dropped out of the sample provides assurance for the reliability of the Negro data, the large white dropout -- one-third of the sample -- necessitates caution and suggests a possibility to be further pursued: It would seem that there may be substantially more movement out of Elmira by low-income whites than by Negroes. This is not explainable by movement to nearby suburbs, for post-office forwarding addresses were carefully checked.

Eleven interviewers were selected by the Project Committee designated by the Mayor's Committee and underwent a brief training program. The six who had had previous interviewing experience were assigned the bulk of the interviews. Negroes were, for the most part, used to interview Negroes. The interviews were conducted largely in a building which houses various community agencies, the others taking place in homes of the interviewers or the youth.

All but 11 of the 125 members of the two samples were seen personally. This includes the several who had moved away to college, in which case the dean was asked to assign a competent interviewer. A special mail questionnaire was sent to those who had moved away, and 11 of these responded. Their answers have been included with the others in the sample.

The Questions

The questions were not designed to stress the specific situation of Negro youth, but to focus on the background, experiences, and attitudes of youth in general. Several questions relating to color and discrimination were included, but these in no way dominated the interview.

There were three types of questions: open-end; brief multiple choice, the choices being contained in the question; and lengthier multiple choice, at which time the interviewee was handed a card of possible answers and asked to select one. There were also a few probe questions. Coding of answers was performed, not by the interviewers, but under the supervision of the study director, thus assuring uniformity.

Throughout the analysis of our data, we performed one additional operation to check our findings. Though both samples were taken from the poorer areas of the community, some socio-economic disparity remained between the two groups. We therefore compared the 36 Negroes and 25 whites whose fathers were in lower-status occupations (farmer, laborer, semiskilled, or service worker). In this way any spurious similarity or hidden difference in the over-all comparison that actually resulted from socio-economic factors would be revealed. (We shall refer to this as "controlling for status.")

The questions were designed by the study director, revised in accordance with criticisms by the Elmira Project Committee and the over-all Discrimination and Low Incomes advisory committee, and pre-tested with high school students in a Long Island community.[4]

Validity

Manifestly this should be considered as a pilot study based on a limited sample. Elmira and its Negro community may, of course, not be typical. The sample, moreover, is small, and limited to one area of a low socio-economic level. The answers to questions on income, family happiness, and discrimination, in particular, may be unconscious distortions, though the distortions are in themselves interesting. Finally, we could not control for a number of possibly relevant variables: personality structure, ethnic background (aside from color), and the like.

The findings of the study are subject to these qualifications. Similar studies in other communities would be helpful in testing its conclusions and its wider application.

III. THE COMMUNITY AND THE SCHOOL

Elmira

Elmira is a city of some 50,000 people located in the southern tier of the state, near the Pennsylvania border. It is highly industrialized, having experienced a rapid expansion under the impetus of World War II production. Four railroads converge on the city. There are twelve locally owned and twelve absentee-owned plants, one firm employing 7000 workers. Manufacturing is characterized by an extremely high proportion of durable goods. Among the major products are fire-fighting equipment, machines and metal products of all kinds, business machines, greeting cards, and the like.

---

[4] The questionnaire, minus the multiple-choice alternatives, is in Appendix B.

The 1800 Negroes in the community live in four sections, surrounded by white ones. A careful study[5] reveals the following pattern of Negro-white relations:

There is little or no discrimination in housing in a few less desirable residential areas near the railroad tracks or industrial property and in the one "interracial" project (which is 80% Negro). Better sections, however, are closed to Negroes. Government positions, semiskilled, and unskilled jobs are open to Negroes, who work alongside whites. There would appear to be some discrimination in employment in smaller factories and in white-collar jobs. There was, at the time of the study, one Negro teacher, policeman, fireman, hospital nurse and social worker. There is no difficulty in access to hospitals, movies, the public school system, department stores and their lunch counters. Discriminatory incidents in the use of hotels, taverns and restaurants have come to light. Mediation by the Mayor's Committee on Human Relations has measurably improved this situation. Many intimate personal services remain segregated.

By and large, informal social contacts among Negro and white adults are avoided, except for some interracial social groups centered in the Negro community. In formal organizations the degree of contact ranges from complete segregation to relatively free contact. Thus there seems to be little segregation, if any, in the Catholic Church, the League of Women Voters, CIO unions, some AFL unions and veteran organizations. The great majority of church-affiliated Negroes are Protestant, but have their own churches. An expanding number of white Protestant churches include Negroes in their membership. The issue of discrimination is still being raised in other organizations, e.g., the Scouts and some craft unions. Negroes seldom participate in the community's high status organizations. On the high school level, school clubs and other extra-curricular activities are open to all. Sororities and fraternities, which discriminate on a social and economic basis as well as along the color line, are not recognized by the school authorities and have no standing in the schools.

The Elmira Free Academy

The Elmira Free Academy provides high school training for approximately 1200 Elmira students. Originally the Academy was the city's only public high school. After World War I, however, overcrowding necessitated the construction of Southside High School. Since then Notre Dame High School has been added to serve Elmira's secondary school needs.

---

[5] Robert B. Johnson, The Nature of the Minority Community: Internal Structure, Reaction, Leadership and Action, unpublished doctoral dissertation, Cornell University, June 1955. The authors appreciate Dr. Johnson's permission to use his material as background for our study.

The Academy draws pupils from all of the social and economic strata of Elmira. Children of wealthy and "well-off" West side families travel some distance to the school, which is located in a deteriorating neighborhood on the East side, on the edge of the largest of the Negro areas. Many youngsters from low income families have only to walk across the street or up the block to school. There has been talk for some years of building a third public high school to serve West Elmira. This move would leave the Academy a student body drawn primarily from low income groups. This "East-West" division is a fact of life in Elmira and is strongly felt among the students, especially among the Eastsiders.

Students at the Academy follow either the "Regents" program of studies or the "Local" program. The latter term is commonly used to denote the program which does not prepare a student to take the New York State Regents Examination and thus is non-college preparatory in nature. More Westsiders follow the college preparatory program than Eastsiders. "Locals" and "Regents" have separate classes in all major subjects, including English, History and Mathematics.

In addition, there may be some truth to the fact that the West side Regents students "run the school," at least in terms of which students are club officers, student council members, yearbook editors, etc., since the Regents program students are in general more highly motivated and better prepared for these activities. Competitive sports constitute the main area in which the Local student can shine. This is particularly true for the boys; football heroes are often "Locals" and often Negroes. That racial discrimination is less evident among teenagers in this school than among adults, generally, is seen in the fact that in recent years, despite the fact that they are proportionately few in number, Negroes have been elected as vice president of the Senior Class, as vice president of the Student Council, and as May Carnival "King," by popular vote of the students. A Negro girl has won the County Legion Oratorical Contest.

The guidance or counselling program at the Academy is handled by the teachers. Each year has two guidance counsellors, a man for the boys and a woman for the girls. The teacher, who is also a guidance counsellor, teaches four classes a day (instead of five) and devotes the extra period to counselling. Since each counsellor is responsible for approximately 150 students, the counselling sessions, which are presumed to cover all problems, including vocational guidance, are often devoted largely to scheduling and changing the student's program. Some guidance counsellors find time to assist students vocationally and in their personal problems. There may be some evidence that some "Local" students feel that such counselling is inadequate.

IV. THE FINDINGS: DEPENDENT VARIABLES

What of Their Future?

Adolescence in our society is complex. At the same time that we expect our youth to enjoy themselves, become educated in a broad sense, and explore the world free of serious responsibilities, we also expect them to plan their careers, to acquire skills and directions. Many studies have shown that as one approaches the end of one's high school years, he becomes committed to a certain type of work life -- even if this is only drifting. It is, therefore, realistic to ask youth about their future plans. These are not irrelevant pipedreams, but influence directions, drives and satisfactions.

A major finding of this study is that wherever trends and significant differences appear, the Negroes have a higher level of aspiration than the whites with a comparably low socio-economic background. Negro aspirations are often directed toward the professions and semiprofessions.

Occupational aspirations. Asked about their vocational aspirations upon entering high school, (2-4),[6] no statistically significant over-all differences between Negroes and whites appear. Some facts, however, are worthy of note.[7] While almost no girls[8] answered "don't know," 33 percent of the Negro boys and 18 percent of the white boys did. There was likewise a tendency for Negro girls to refer to professions (41%) while white girls specified clerical positions (47%). Only 1 Negro boy (4%) but 6 white boys (22%) chose a manual skill.

---

[6] Numbers in parentheses refer to the numbers on the questionnaire reproduced in Appendix B.

[7] Throughout this report we have noted where statistically significant differences appeared, i.e., where the magnitude of difference is such that it could have occurred by chance only 5 or fewer times out of a hundred. In many cases, however, we have also pointed to and discussed differences which did not meet tests of statistical significance. We have done so in the belief that such differences may indicate important trends which should not be ignored. A strong defense of this position appears in Lipset, Trow, and Coleman, Union Democracy, Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press 1956, pp. 427-432.

[8] The final sample contained 27 Negro and 27 white boys, 34 Negro and 37 white girls.

Turning to what they would like to do now (2-6), we find that almost all have decided. Here again Negroes aim at a higher level: 64 percent of the Negro boys, compared to 41 percent of the white boys, want to be professionals or semiprofessionals. There is relatively little change in choice of occupation between entry into high school and now. Controlling for status, we find that more than twice as high a proportion of Negroes as of whites wish to become professionals (52% vs. 24%).

The leading patterns thus seem to be: Negro boys and girls wish to become professionals and semiprofessionals (boys, 64%; girls, 47%); white boys select the professions and skilled manual work (56%); white girls, clerical and sales work (46%).

The choice of specific professions is of interest. While the white boys with a professional orientation mostly want to be engineers, the Negro boys range wider: They mention chemist, engineer, draftsman, dentist, teacher, veterinarian, lawyer, and social worker. The white girls with professional aspirations want to be teachers or nurses, as do most of the Negro girls, but the latter also mention social worker, musician, and child psychologist.

The occupational aspirations of the girls, however, are not to be taken at face value. Few wish to have careers. Most say they will work only to make ends meet, or for a short while after marriage. Significantly more Negro girls, however, anticipate that they will have to work. This seems to be because of the greater number of Negroes in the lowest-status group, for when we control for status, the difference disappears.

Specific occupations. When asked how they felt about specific occupations (2-13 to 2-36), the Negro boys gave a significantly higher preference than the whites to doctor, lawyer, teacher, accountant and barber-shop owner (which often has high prestige in the Negro community); the white boys rated farmer higher than did the Negroes. From these results, it appears that Negro youngsters have more of an identification with the higher occupation levels. Controlled for status, however, the size of the difference -- except on toolmaker - diminishes. On all thirteen occupations, except farmer and toolmaker, a higher proportion of Negro boys say they would like it; this is true within the lowest-status group for all occupations but toolmaker. It may be that concrete regular jobs -- on whatever level -- are more important to Negroes. On the other hand, a majority of the Negroes say they "would like it" only for doctor or lawyer, teacher, executive, and electrician. A minority of whites say they "would like it" for every one of the occupations. A majority of Negro boys reject ("wouldn't like it") mailman, truck driver, cook or valet, and farmer. A majority of whites reject accountant, barber-shop owner, salesman, mailman, and cook or valet.

There are neither significant differences nor trends of any sort on this question among the girls.

We also inquired into preference for working with people, things, or ideas (2-37). Almost all females prefer the first, as do two-thirds of the Negro males. The white boys, however, give almost equal preference to working with people and with things. As we shall see later, skilled manual work is familiar and central to the future of the white boys.

Dreams and expectations. The tendency for Negroes to aspire to higher levels than do whites, particularly those from the lowest socio-economic level, is evident also in the responses to the two questions: What would they be doing ten years hence if their wildest dreams were realized (2-39), and what did they realistically expect to be doing (2-41). Fifty-five percent of the Negro boys and 37 percent of the white boys dream of being executives or professionals; 38 percent of the Negro girls and 11 percent of the white girls give these answers. When status is controlled 47 percent of the Negroes as against only 8 percent of the latter have such high dreams.

Obviously, not many expect their wildest dreams to be realized, and there is no large over-all difference between what the Negroes and whites realistically expect to be doing ten years hence (2-41). The tendency toward higher-status expectations among Negroes nonetheless persists, with 27 percent of the Negro males, 18 percent of the white males, 21 percent of the Negro females, and 5 percent of the white females *expecting* to be professionals ten years hence. This tendency is even more strongly expressed in income expectations (2-44), where the median income anticipated -- recall, this is not dreams, but expectations -- by the Negroes is significantly higher than by the whites. Less than half (48%) of the Negroes expect to have a weekly family income under $125, in contrast to 74 percent of the whites. Controlled for status, the difference is more significant: While only 61 percent of the Negroes expect to earn under $150 per week, *every* white in this lowest-status groups expects to earn less.

Given the generally lower status of the Negro parents, and the apparent tendency of the Negro youth to aspire to a higher level than the white, we are not surprised to find how the Negroes compare their own anticipated future to the achievements of their parents (2-45). Almost none expects to do less well than his parent of the same sex. But many whites expect to do "about the same" and there is a significantly larger number of Negroes who expect to do better in life: Of the Negro males, 71 percent expect to do better, in contrast to 59 percent of the white males; the female figures are 76 percent Negro, 18 percent white. This difference remains significant when controlled for status: 67 percent of the Negroes, but only 32 percent of the whites, anticipate improvement over their parents' lot.

Perhaps the most destructive feeling for the poor in times of prosperity is the sense of being in a dead end, of not getting any place, and not knowing "where to go from here." None of those interviewed think they will probably have this feeling ten years hence and only a small number think there is a good chance (2-43). There is no significant difference between Negroes and whites on this score, though in the lowest-status group more whites (48% vs. 22%) tend to be pretty sure that they will not feel this way. This should not be interpreted as a sense of realism or gloom on the part of Negroes. It may be primarily a result of the greater certainty of the white girls; since they consistently hope for less and expect less, they realistically anticipate less frustration.

When asked about what factors seemed to be crucial in getting ahead in life (2-38), the answers showed no cynicism among either Negroes or whites: Neither "just plain luck" or "knowing the right people" is seen as primary. The dominant stress by all four groups is on "improving your education and experience" and "working hard."

College. Significantly more of the Negroes intend to apply and hope to go to college: 63 percent of the Negro boys, 26 percent of the white boys, 43 percent of the Negro girls and only 11 percent of the white girls are in this category. The difference is even more striking when status is controlled: 58 percent of the Negroes and only 8 percent of the whites plan on college. This commitment to college is not only a surface notion; for more of the Negroes also report that they would have strong feelings about not being able to go (2-47, 2-48). Of the Negro boys, 60 percent say they would mind very much; comparable figures are 18 percent of white boys, 43 percent of Negro girls, and 11 percent of white girls. The difference becomes even greater when status is controlled (53% vs. 4% would mind very much). Nor is this feeling entirely visionary. Of the 20 Negroes in the sample who have graduated from high school, 7 are now attending college and 2 others are in nurse's training. Of the 12 white graduates, only 2 are in college.[9] It must be remembered that the whites selected for this sample come from a depressed area of the city.

If we look at the reasons given for going to college (2-49, 2-50), we find that preparation for a career is given by a majority of all groups but white females. They -- whose plans, of the four groups, are most removed from college -- more often stress a general education.

---

[9] The problem of the degree of realism involved in these hopes and plans for college as well as in the occupational aspirations is discussed below.

Work Experience

Most studies concerning occupational aspirations include only those youngsters who are still in high school. Our sample of 125, however, contains 58 who are still in school (30 Negroes, 28 whites) and 67 who have either dropped out of school or have graduated. While none have been out of school more than two years, the inquiries on work experience among these 67 do have some significant implications. Although the Negroes have no lower and possibly higher occupational aspirations than the low-status whites of our sample, their hopes are not reflected in experience in the job world, with one exception. Where there is a difference between Negroes and whites, it is to the former's disadvantage.

The exception referred to is noted above: A higher proportion of Negroes have gone on to college or further training. Of the 67 out of school, 50 have held jobs -- 18 of the 31 Negroes and 32 of the 36 whites. The others have gone on to college, gotten married, or entered military service. The following comparison is based on these 50. The differences are even more striking when it is noted that of the 18 Negroes, 14 are high school graduates, whereas only 11 of the 32 whites graduated.

Number of jobs. The Negroes have, since leaving school, had 1.5 jobs on the average, the whites, 2. This is probably because the whites (having more dropouts) have been out of school longer, though we cannot rule out the possibility -- indicated below -- that the whites have a better chance to improve their jobs.

Occupation. The occupational range of the jobs held by whites was somewhat larger than that held by Negroes. Fully 15 (58%) of the 26 jobs held by Negroes were service jobs, with 5 being unskilled or semiskilled factory work. Of the 63 jobs held by whites 22 (35%) were factory jobs, 30 percent were service jobs, and 25 percent clerical positions. One white boy had become a draftsman, one white girl an office manager.

Industry. The range of industries in which the whites worked was likewise broader. Of the 26 jobs held by Negroes, 11 were with employers who rendered personal service, 6 were with manufacturers, and 7 with retailers. Of the 63 white jobs, 15 (all girls) were in personal service, 21 in manufacturing, and 10 in retail industry. We find no Negroes, as we do find whites, in construction, wholesale, utilities, finance, or hospitals.

Source of jobs. The major sources of jobs for both Negroes and whites were personal contact and their own initiative, some 60 percent of each group using these two sources. There was, however, a difference, in that twice as many Negroes got their jobs through friends and relatives rather than through their own initiative, the reverse being the case for whites. The difference is accounted for by the females: 8 of the 15 Negro female jobs came through personal contact. Given the present occupational distribution of Negroes, one can infer that this reliance on personal contact for newcomers to the job market greatly limits their opportunities. Of significance to the school and community is the fact that only 4 of the Negro and 11 of the white jobs came through school or the State Employment Service.

Pay. The salary comparisons between Negroes and whites are treated in terms of the starting salary on the first full-time job and the latest salary on the last or current job. There is a substantial difference between the male job holders in the two groups. Negro boys started with a median weekly salary of $38.50, whites with $44. Not only did white boys start at a higher level, but they were likely to improve their pay more rapidly as time went on. The latest median salary was $42 for Negroes and $62 for whites.

The difference between Negro and white girls is less marked, both starting at a median salary of $30. Their latest median salaries were $40 and $39.50. This does not take into account, however, the question of graduation from school. Taking only graduates, we find that the Negro girl starts with and currently earns the same as all Negro girls ($30-$40); the white girl starts at $40 and goes up to $42.50.

Current status. There seems to be less pressure on or opportunity for Negro boys to enter the civilian labor market. At the time of the interview, only 3 of the 14 Negro boys out of school were employed, with 1 seeking work; 6 had gone to college and 4 entered military service. Of the 11 white boys, 7 were working, 1 seeking work, 1 in college, and the status of 2 was unknown. The major difference between the Negro and white girls is found in the numbers not engaged in any work or training activity (primarily because of marriage): 4 of the 17 Negro girls (24%) in contrast to 10 of the 25 white girls (40%).

While the groups do not differ on what is most and what is least satisfactory about their job experiences, significantly more white youngsters (61% vs. 45%) answered "yes" when asked whether the jobs they had held would help them in the future (1-66). Ordinarily this might appear as if the Negro youngsters had less meaningful jobs. However, when we control for status, the difference disappears. This suggests that the feeling of meaningless work experience is probably a matter of low economic position.

A number of questions dealt with the jobs held by those youth still in school (1-69 to 1-72). No Negro-white differences emerge. Perhaps of even greater significance is the absence of any indication that there is pressure on these youth to work. Most of those who did work did so because they wanted pocket money, or just felt like working.

The Community

In view of the tendency of the Negroes to aspire to relatively high-level occupations, one might expect them to express greater dissatisfaction with Elmira and a greater desire to leave it, since they might see its small size as a handicap to getting ahead. In fact, we find no difference in the percentages of Negro and white boys (55% of each) who think it is a fine place (2-51). While the girls are more dissatisfied, the Negro girl stands out as being particularly negative about the community: Only 9 percent think it is a fine place, whereas 32 percent of the white girls hold this opinion. Few feel it is not a good place to live; but of the 22 in the entire sample who do, 15 are Negro girls. Asked about staying in Elmira the rest of their lives (2-52), the Negro girls again are more negative: 73 percent would not like to stay, in contrast to 38 percent of the white girls. The boys do not differ on their negative feelings; however, the white boys tend to be more positive, the Negro boys being more neutral: 29 percent of the former very much wish to stay, but only 4 percent of the latter. The significant difference between the girls, and the tendency of Negro boys toward neutrality, disappear when we control for status. Almost half of each of the lower status groups would not like to stay.

The reasons given for their feelings about the community and their plans for staying are instructive. By and large -- with the exception of the Negro girls -- most of them express a general sense of satisfaction and rootedness. "This is home," most seem to be saying, "and so far it's been pretty friendly to me." A minority of whites and of the Negro boys have criticisms, but the critical patterns are different. Four of the 10 white boys and 5 of the 10 white girls who are critical specify the lack of recreational facilities for youth. Only 2 of each refer to limited job opportunities. The other reasons given are general, but not very serious.[10] Of the 9 Negro boys who offer criticism, however, 8 refer directly or indirectly to limited job opportunities. None of these mentions explicitly that the limitations are restricted to Negroes, though in view of the fact that only 2 white boys raise this question, it seems reasonable to assume that this factor is involved in their attitude.

Negro girls are, unquestionably, least happy in the community. Not many refer to Elmira in an enthusiastic, positive sense; any absence of criticism and any desire to stay is most often explained by "I don't know other places," and "my family and friends are here." Of the 34 Negro girls, 24 offer explicit criticism of Elmira. The stress here is on the restrictions that confront Negroes: 11 of the 24 give some such reason as a basis for dissatisfaction. More often than not, these refer to job opportunities. Of the 24 complainants, 14 refer to jobs, 13 to inadequate recreational facilities (some give more than one reason).

---

[10] It should be recalled that a much larger number of whites dropped out of the original sample. They may be the more dissatisfied ones.

The reaction of the Negro girl may be a realistic response to a difficult situation. The Negro woman is in a double minority position: as a member of a racial minority and as a woman. Also her anticipations for a "normal" married life are realistically less than even those of the white girls of the same economic background. She might expect, using her parents or the parents of her Negro friends as models, a more disrupted marriage and more outside work of an unskilled or service nature. We might speculate, moreover, that one reason for the lesser dissatisfaction of the Negro boy than of the Negro girl is the former's greater opportunity to achieve high status in high school through competence in athletics. The comparable status role for a girl is that of physical attractiveness; the Negro girl, however, is not as likely to become "beauty queen" as the Negro boy is to become a "football hero."

The greater dissatisfaction of the Negro girl is also expressed in responses to the question of whether Elmira is better for Negroes than other places (2-52). While 11 of the 27 boys say it is better, and 12 think it is about the same or do not know, only 6 of the 34 girls indicate that it is better. However, all other Negro girls are neutral, whereas four Negro boys think it is better for Negroes in some other places.

The Role and Meaning of High School

In seeking to understand the tendency toward higher vocational aspirations of the Negro youth compared to the white youth of a low economic status, and the bearing of education on these aspirations, we turn to an analysis of the attitudes toward, meaning of, and experiences in, high school. As indicated earlier, this area is also of interest to us directly.

In general, the Negroes show a more positive and constructive attitude toward school than the corresponding white youth. This may be related to the Negro's minority status. He expects more of himself and maintains more of a direction in his academic pursuits. This happens in spite of the fact that the Negro parents are no better educated or more successful financially or occupationally than the low-status white parents. Evidently, education is the road to achievement for the Negro, or so he believes.

Objective data. The Negroes do at least as well as, if not better than, the whites in our sample, according to traditional educational standards. Using a Henmon-Nelson I.Q. (in use in Elmira at the time) which was obtained at the time the student was in eighth grade, we found no reliable difference between the Negroes and the whites. The median rating of the white boys was only slightly higher than that of the Negro boys; Negro girls rated somewhat higher than white girls. This is true despite the fact that the Negro sample was somewhat lower even than the low-status white group studied in general socio-economic position, a factor usually correlated with I.Q.[11] However, all of the 12 top I.Q. scores are white; 8 of these are from the comparatively upper-status groups of our sample.

The Negro boys are more often enrolled in academic or commercial programs (59% as against 26% of the white boys) and less often in the shop and art programs (26% as against 63% of the white boys). A parallel difference exists for the girls: 62 percent of Negroes and 38 percent of whites are in academic and commercial programs, whereas 43 percent of the latter major in home economics. These statistically significant differences remain when controlling for socio-economic status.

Consistent with the somewhat greater stress on education by the Negroes is the tendency for a higher proportion of Negroes to enroll in the more difficult Regents (college preparatory) program rather than the Local program: 41 percent of the Negro students are in the former compared to 32 percent of the low-status whites. This is primarily due to the Negro boys, 48 percent of whom are Regents students.

An over-all comparison of average Negro and white grades in the sample shows the former doing better (except that all five A students are white, four of them being from the "upper-status" group). Since Regents and Local students are marked on different bases, however, the over-all comparison tells us little. Among the Local students, the Negroes get better grades: 42 percent have a C average (there are no A's or B's); only 13 percent of the whites do this well. Among those who are Regents students, on the other hand, the white youth have higher averages: half of the whites have an A or B average, whereas no Negroes obtained A and only 26 percent are B students.

---

[11] Compared with the normal curve of intelligence for the population as a whole, both Negro and white groups in this study are found to rate relatively low on the scale. The reader, however, should recall the consensus among social scientists that I.Q. tests are generally biased in favor of higher-status groups.

School experiences. There seems little question that school experience tends to have a different meaning for the Negro than for these white youngsters. As noted above, fewer Negroes drop out of school before graduation, and this difference persists when we control for status. Of those out of school, the numbers graduating were: 9 of 14 (64%) Negro boys; 6 of 11 (54%) white boys; 11 of 17 (65%) Negro girls; and 6 of 25 (24%) white girls. (It is of interest that both of the respondents who told the interviewer that they had graduated, but who were dropouts according to school records, were Negro.) Moreover, within the graduating group, an interesting difference emerges: All but one of the Negro male graduates were enrolled in the academic program; all of the white male graduates were in the shop program. The girl graduates were almost all in the commercial program. To the extent that these small numbers are indicative of any trend, it would seem that school is seen as a less immediately utilitarian activity by those Negro boys who go on to graduate. This is confirmed by the higher proportion of Negro male graduates who were Regents students.

There is no clear pattern of reasons for dropping out of school. Not one of the Negroes who left did so because his family needed him to go to work; this is in contrast to 6 whites. Obviously, this is not a clear result of the economic status of the family. for the Negro families are no more well-to-do than the whites.

We also find a curious difference in the number of reported guidance meetings attended in school. Significantly more white youngsters (28 white, 9 Negro) reported that they had no meetings, and more Negroes reported that they had two or more meetings during their last year in school. This difference remains when controlling for status. The disparity is curious in light of the information that every member of the class had at least two meetings with his advisor. In part, it may be accounted for if school dropouts do not have counseling meetings, and whites drop out more often. But it is consistent with our over-all findings to interpret this more subtly. A process of selective perception on the part of the whites would seem to be involved here. Tending to have a less positive, a more desultory attitude toward school than the Negroes, the whites of this study tend to forget or deny school experiences. The fact that fewer are interested in occupations that require advanced training may also be relevant. Negroes need more advice for this reason, and either seek out or are sought out by those who can help them.

That this seems to be the case is substantiated by the several questions dealing with teachers. Though the differences are not large, the Negroes tend more to seek out the advice of teachers (this difference does not hold when controlled for status) and to see them as more interested in the future of their students (1-49, 1-60). It is of general interest to note that practically none of the students say that teachers do not really care about their students' futures.

A significant difference is found in the youngsters' attitude toward whether they did as well as they could in school (1-61). Of the Negroes only 16 percent answered this question affirmatively, in contrast to 36 percent of the whites. The differences grow even larger when we control for status. There are at least two possible explanations. One is more or less objective -- it is possible that the Negroes worked less hard. If this were the case, the average grades of the Negro students would be worse than those of the whites, assuming generally equal ability; yet our data demonstrated that this is not the case. The second reason would be subjective: The Negroes expect more of themselves in school; they are less satisfied with any given level of performance than are the whites, and although they do better, it seems less satisfactory. This is consistent with the tendency of the Negroes to have higher expectations regarding college and future occupations.

It is interesting to note that the whites and Negroes exaggerate equally when asked what their average grades were (1-58). The typical response was for the D student -- based on the actual school records -- to say he obtained a C; for the C student to say B. Evidently any need for over-compensation by Negroes does not manifest itself in this area.

A plurality among both whites and Negroes sees high school as important because one cannot get any place today -- particularly in the job world -- without an education. Nine-tenths of each group say that they would definitely choose to go to high school again if they were fourteen and it was up to them.

Discrimination. Only 6 Negroes say that they were discriminated against in school on the basis of color (1-58a, 1-62). For the most part, reference is made to specific incidents and invariably to individual teachers, and never to a general atmosphere of discrimination in the school. The overwhelming majority cite no instances of discrimination, nor any feeling of its prevalence.

V. THE FINDINGS: BACKGROUND FACTORS

Having seen that Negro high school youth, in this sample, tend to be relatively more possessed by the "American dream" of achievement, and that they tend to see their way to such achievement as lying through formal education, let us turn to some of the background factors in their lives which are not only of interest and significance in themselves but may help to explain the differences we have found.

Origin. Ever since the "Great Migration" of Negroes from South to North began in 1910, northern Negro communities, by and large, have contained large segments of relatively newer arrivals. This holds true in the present case. While 70 percent of the white youth in this sample were born in Elmira -- and all but two were born in the North -- half the Negro youth are "local products," the other half equally divided between northern and southern origin. Four-fifths of the latter, however, have lived in Elmira five years or more. Half of the whites are in Elmira for the second generation, their parents having lived there as children. Only 28 percent of the Negro mothers and 8 percent of the fathers, however, were Elmira residents as children, 40 percent of the mothers and 50 percent of the fathers having come from the South. Thus the white sample is significantly more indigenous to Elmira and to the North than is the Negro sample.

Family income. These are not depression children. Almost none of the fathers are currently unemployed. According to the youth, the households have a relatively decent income, the Negro median of those who give income figures being $100, the white median somewhat over $125. (These figures are not precise, since we asked the youth to select income categories, e.g., $90-99, $100-124.) The median family income for Elmira in 1950, as reported by the Census, came to $53 a week. Inflation and improved earnings notwithstanding in the seven intervening years, it is likely that our youth are exaggerating their family incomes. But there is no reason to think that either Negro or white is more prone to do so. The weekly earnings of the man of the house are significantly less for Negroes than for whites. This differential remains even when we control for status. There is, however, little difference between Negroes and whites in total household income. As is to be expected, this discrepancy is a result of the fact that many more Negro than white women are employed: only 27 percent of the Negro mothers are housewives, compared to 56 percent of the white mothers.

Parents' occupation. Looking at the father's occupational background, we find a significant difference between Negro and white. When these youngsters were children, 46 percent of the white fathers were skilled workers, and another 22 percent semiskilled; 21 percent of the Negro fathers were semiskilled, with service and skilled workers constituting 18 percent each. The difference between white and Negro fathers persists today, except that more white fathers have moved into such occupational categories as managerial, white collar, and professional, and more Negro fathers -- 33 percent of those whose present occupations are known -- are now service workers. Only 1 Negro father, in this intervening period, moved from the lower- to the upper-status group, whereas 7 white fathers did. Thus the fathers of our Negro youth evidently earn less because they are, on the average, in occupations of a lower status than even this poorest sample of the white community, and have less opportunity for mobility. This is paralleled by the occupations of the mothers who work. While the Negro mothers are typically in domestic and other service, proportionately more white working mothers are in semiskilled and clerical jobs. These differences do not disappear even when we control for status.

Parents' education. The most obvious explanation for the lower occupational status of Negro parents would seem to be their more frequent origin from outside the community and from the South. When, however, we compare the fathers' occupations for the southern and northern Negro youth, this possibility is not substantiated. A second alternative explanation would be the educational background of the parents. We do find differences between Negroes and whites on this score, in the expected direction, but there is no clearcut, linear pattern. In fact, there seem to be two patterns.

It first should be pointed out that this is a low-education group as a whole: Of the 250 parents of our total sample, only 8 had attended college and only 2 graduated! Half of the Negro fathers did not complete grade school (30 of 61), in contrast to 17 percent (11 of 64) of the white fathers. (The assumption is made here that where no answer was given, the fathers had less than a completed grade school education.) On the other hand, when the Negro fathers did go to high school, their children report them as going on to graduate and even going on to enter college significantly more often than the white fathers who entered high school. These trends persist when controlled for status. Although the differences in the mothers' education are not large, they point in the same direction. Altogether, more of the Negroes than the whites have at least one parent who has been graduated from high school (46% vs. 28%).

In summary, we might say that the Negro youth more often has a relatively unsuccessful father than the lower-class white youth of this sample. The average mobility of the Negro father seems to be less, as is the general level of economic success. The white youth, on the other hand, more often has a father who is "respectable" by American standards: He is a skilled worker, earns a decent wage for his family, and has had some high school training. This is, of course, over and above the lower status of the Negro per se in our society, of which the Negro youth is well aware.

There is, however, some hesitation on the part of the Negro youth to admit that his father is not successful. When asked how their fathers have done in life (1-47), we find only a small difference between Negro and white: 65 percent of the former and 76 percent of the latter see their fathers as "having done o.k." or better. Clearly, the Negro youth, in responding this way, is either using atypical criteria of success or repressing the facts of the situation. Or it may be that he is saying: In view of the handicaps he has faced, he has succeeded, though the outward signs do not show this.

For our purposes, however, the most important conclusion here is that, in the context of our accepted standards of success, the white youth seems to have someone in his immediate family with whom he can identify, whom he can model himself after. This serves as some sort of anchor. The Negro youth most often does not.

Comparison to fathers. Heretofore, we have considered the Negro and white samples as wholes. Further insight into the question of vocational aspirations is attained by a comparison of the father's occupation of each boy with the occupation the boy now would like to enter (2-6) and the one he realistically expects to be in ten years hence (2-41). In our sample, we find consistently that the Negro boy wishes and expects to improve his position relative to his father's more often than does the white boy.

All 27 Negro boys aspire to a higher occupation than their fathers followed when they were children.[12] (One boy, who plans to be a jet mechanic while his father was a farmer, might be regarded as an exception. But since he is a southern Negro it is not likely that "farmer" ranks higher for him than "jet mechanic," even though it ranks higher in the Census classification, on which our scale is based. Therefore farmer is here ranked lower than jet mechanic.) Though most of the white sons aim higher than the occupations of their fathers, 31 percent were content with either the same kind of occupation or a lower ranking one.

The same pattern holds when comparing the son's present aspiration to the father's present occupation. All but one of the Negroes seek improvement, and that one wants an occupation on the same level. Of the white boys, 77 percent want a higher level of occupation, 5 percent are content to stay on the same level, and 18 percent select a lower level.

Nor does the pattern change when we turn to expectations. All but one of the Negro boys thought they would hold better jobs in ten years than their fathers held when they were children. Of the white youth, however, only 61 percent thought they would hold higher positions; 22 percent see themselves on the same level; and 17 percent foresee jobs which are on a lower level. Using the father's present occupation as the basis, all but one of the Negroes see improvement, compared to 67 percent of the whites, while 9 percent of the latter anticipate jobs on the same level and 24 percent on a lower level.

---

[12] Occupations were ranked as follows, from low to high: domestic, laborers and semiskilled, personal and protective service, skilled, farmer, clerical-sales, small business, semiprofessional, executive, professional. The "don't know"s were excluded from these comparisons.

In good measure, these differences are probably a result of the original greater concentration of Negro fathers in the lower-status occupations. There is simply more room to improve. When we compare the 17 Negro and 9 white boys from the lowest-status groups, the difference tends to disappear. Each of these 9 white boys *wants* to improve over his father's past and present occupations, as do all the 17 Negro boys. There is, however, a difference in *expectations*: 3 of the white boys expect the same level as the father's *earlier* occupation, compared to none of the Negroes. Two of the whites see themselves as lower than their father's *present* occupations, 1 on the same level, again compared to none of the Negroes.

This finding tends to be substantiated by a comparison of Negroes and whites (here we did not separate the sexes) from the "upper-status" group in our sample. A somewhat higher proportion of the Negro youth than of the white youth aspire to business, white-collar, or professional occupations both at the point of entering high school, at present, in their wildest dreams, and in their realistic expectations ten years hence. The last is particularly striking: Excluding those girls who expect to be housewives, 9 of the 10 Negroes of both sexes, but only 12 of the 21 whites, expect to be in these high occupational groups.

Role models. While personality formation is based primarily upon identification with parental figures, occupational aspirations may often be inspired by models to whom one is not personally related, or even to figures one knows only from afar. In seeking the explanation for any differences between Negroes and whites in this area, we asked two questions, one about individuals known personally who are considered successful (1-48), the other about individuals -- either known personally or about whom one has heard -- that the youth admires (2-52a, 52b). There is no difference in the *number* of successes the two groups point to: About two-thirds of each group know somebody close whom they consider to be successful. Analyzing the reasons *why* they consider these individuals successful, however, we come across a highly significant difference. We classified the reasons into three types: jobs, business, possessions; professional and college achievement; and general. *Negroes, far more often than whites, select people whose accomplishment is based on education*.

On the question of whom one admires, there are no differences between the Negroes and whites, with one exception: 6 Negro boys and 4 Negro girls refer to widely known Negroes (Ralph Bunche, Marian Anderson, Thurgood Marshall, and so forth). The whites tend to select popular culture heroes (the girls, actresses; the boys, sports figures). Nor do the reasons given for admiring figures known personally differ substantially. The important finding here is that a majority of all four groups, particularly the girls, refer to no one they admire.

Family structure. Not only does the Negro youth more often come from a home of lower socio-economic and educational status than even our lower-class white youth, but he also tends to come from a more disorganized family structure.[13]

Out of our total sample of 125 there are 55 (44%) youth from homes that no longer contain both biological parents. This type of home we call disorganized (although sometimes a stepparent makes it stable). This proportion of disorganized families, so much larger than the figures for the state as a whole, is accounted for by three factors: (1) our sample consists of 16-20 year olds, which presumably makes their parents older than the total married population; (2) it consists predominantly of working-class people, among whom death and separation is more widespread than among the total population; (3) almost half our sample are Negroes, whose death and separation rates are higher than those of the total population.

This third point is clearly reflected in our study. More Negro respondents than whites come from disorganized homes (58% vs. 31%). Moreover, when we compare those who come from such homes, we find that the Negro youth are subjected to greater hardships. Thus, more Negroes have both parents missing (29% vs. 20%), and the home was broken when the child was under ten years of age more often among Negroes (69% vs. 45%). Further, it would seem that the death of a parent -- though a most unhappy event and one which has serious consequences -- is less destructive than desertion, separation, or divorce, with all the implications these bear for the quality of family life before and after the break-up. Of the missing white parents, half died; of the missing Negro parents, 24 percent died.

When a white child's home is broken, the dominant pattern is for the child to remain with its mother. Thus, of the 20 white youth from broken homes, 13 were with the mother, and another 3 with a parent who remarried. Of the 35 Negro youth, 10 were with the mother and 6 with a parent who remarried. Eight of the Negro children lived with a grandmother and mother or grandmother, 5 with their fathers, the reports on the role of parents in influencing the young people's choice of careers (2-12).

---

[13] The data presented in this section are germane not only to the specific focus of our study; they raise questions which should be of general concern to the community.

We do, however, find one difference: While none of the parents of either group actually decide what the young people are to do, significantly more Negro youngsters report that their parents actively help them plan their future. Only 7 Negroes, but 19 whites, say their parents are letting them go their own way (1-51). This difference is even stronger when we control for status. This must be seen in the context of the greater instability of the Negro family -- the absence of parents from the home, as well as the greater likelihood that the Negro mother is working.

Two further items in this area are of interest precisely because there are no Negro-white differences. While it is not surprising that, given the traditionally matriarchal Negro family, one-third of the Negroes say their mothers "wear the pants" in the family, we find that the same proportion of whites respond in this way. Similarly surprising is the identical response to the question "Have your folks brought you up to feel that you're as good as anyone else?" It might have been expected that Negro children would have been told this more often, in the compensating fashion of out-groups. But just half of each group gives this answer, and the similarity continues for the lowest-status groups. Evidently this is a lower-class pattern, not unique to Negroes.

There are likewise no significant differences on the question of punishment and reward (1-53, 1-54). In general, there is a tendency for Negro children to recall being rewarded as well as punished more often. Only 1 Negro says he was seldom rewarded, compared to 11 whites. Thirty-two Negroes were rewarded for school activities, compared to 21 whites. This tendency is consistent with a greater active interest on the part of Negro parents.

The home. The final questions we explored concern the home. Here too we find few differences between the Negroes and the lower-status whites of our study. While 9 of the 64 white households have 3 or 4 rooms, only 1 Negro lives in so small a home. The median number of rooms for both is about 6.5. Negro households, however, contain more people: 33 percent have 7 or more people, whereas only 19 percent of white households are that large.

More whites own their own homes (60% vs. 46%), but among the homeowners, the reported valuation of Negro homes is higher. There is little difference in reported rentals. About half of each group say they have their own rooms and three-fifths feel their house is very comfortable. Evidently Negroes are no more or less ashamed of their homes than are whites, for three-fifths of each report frequent home visits by their friends.

It is of interest to note that 90 percent of the entire sample report fewer than 150 books in their homes. There is no significant difference between Negroes and whites, though the former tend to say they have more books. The one significant difference which does emerge in regard to possessions is related to a widespread stereotype: More white families own a car and a TV set, whereas more Negro families go without a car and have only a TV set. This is, however, a function of status, for the difference disappears when status is controlled.

There is, then, nothing substantial in the home which suggests a cause for Negro-white differences in aspirations.

VI. INTRA-NEGRO COMPARISONS

We have seen that the concentration of Negroes in the lower-status segment of the community has effects similar to those manifested by lower-status whites. Yet our data show that, over and above economic status, being Negro also plays a significant role in the aspirations and experiences of youth. In the attempt to analyze what it is in being Negro that has this impact, we made a number of breakdowns of our data.

Family stability. Our first comparison was between the 35 Negro youth from disorganized families and the 26 from stable families. There are only slight differences in the occupational aspirations of the two groups. A slightly higher proportion of those from broken homes wanted to be professionals and semiprofessionals when they entered high school, but the difference disappears in their present aspirations. Nor, when asked about specific occupations, did the two groups of Negroes differ. Asked about their wildest dreams, those from broken homes more often hope to be executives or professionals, but again the difference disappears when asked about realistic expectations ten years hence. Those from broken homes are significantly more decided about their careers, as they are about being sure that they will not find themselves in a dead end in ten years (2-43). Those from stable homes, however, tend to plan on going to college more often than the others, and there is a significant difference, in the same direction, in how much they would mind not going.

Close analysis of these similarities and differences suggests the following explanation: the further removed from concrete plans and realities, the more likely are those from broken homes to let their imaginations soar.

The two groups do not differ in their feelings about Elmira.

They tend to differ on their school records, those from stable homes doing somewhat better, though in only one case -- grades -- is the difference notable. But those from stable homes tend to have a larger proportion of high I.Q. scores, enrollment in the Regents program, self-reporting of higher grades, guidance meetings, feeling that teachers are interested in what happens to students, and feeling that they did as well as they could in school. Moreover, every one of the 9 Negro school dropouts comes from an unstable home.

Finally, those from broken homes have a larger proportion of youth who never asked for advice, who report not knowing people who are successful, and who would turn to no one for help in getting started.

There are a number of other differences. More of those from unstable homes were born in the South, as were more of their parents. (The difference is particularly striking for their fathers.) Fewer of their fathers have had any high school, but the mothers differ little. There is little difference in the occupations of the fathers; but this is probably attributable to the exclusion from the comparison of those who do not know what their fathers' occupations are or whose fathers are dead (13 of the unstable group, 2 of the stable group).

Those from unbroken homes more often lived in family-owned dwellings, have their own rooms, and have more books in the house -- but the differences are not great.

Those from unbroken homes more often report their fathers as "wearing the pants." On all other questions dealing with the orientation to the family, they indicate greater solidarity, happiness, and integration (1-41 to 1-46). But the differences are not immense.

From these data, it seems that the stability of the home does have some effect on the youth in our areas of concern. More than anything else, it seems to be related to the realism and concrete planning in the youngsters' lives. Thus the effects are seen in the better school records and experiences of those from stable homes. It does not, however, seem to be an overwhelmingly decisive factor. (In this respect, it is well to recall the existence of surrogate parents in many of the households which are "disorganized" by our definition.) The fact that there are proportionately more Negro than white youth from broken homes may thus be one factor in the differences in levels of aspiration of the two groups.

Parental education. We next compared the 28 Negro respondents who had had at least one parent who graduated from high school to the 33 whose parents had less education. We find no major differences between the two groups on any aspect of aspirations, anticipation for the future, college plans, or the like. Nor do they differ on feelings about Elmira.

We do find, however, substantial differences in their school records. Those from the "high" educational background do better at school: Only 3 of the 11 Negro dropouts are from the "high"; their I.Q. distribution tends to be higher, as is the proportion who get better grades. They also have a greater enrollment in the Regents program and significantly more report B grades. Fewer of them feel that they did not do as well as they could have in school. The two groups do not differ on the number of guidance meetings held, or on the interest of teachers in students.

As we would expect, more of the "highs" were born in the North, more of their parents are northern, more of them are from stable homes with both parents present, more of them have fathers who are skilled workers or higher. None of these differences, however, are statistically significant.

There is little difference in the home patterns or with respect to family integration. However, the "lows" more often report that their parents were less than fairly happy, that they know no one who has been successful, that they have never asked for advice, and that they have no one to turn to for help in getting started.

In sum, among Negroes, high school graduation of one parent seems to be related to actual school achievement, and there is some indication that the homes offer a greater basis for mobility. But here again, it is far from being a decisive factor.

Northern and southern Negroes. Our final intra-Negro breakdown was a comparison of the 33 respondents whose mothers spent their girlhood in Elmira or elsewhere in the North and the 26 whose mothers came from the South. Once again, we find relatively few differences.

A somewhat higher proportion of the northern group expect to be in professional and semiprofessional occupations ten years hence. Other than this, there are no differences in occupational aspirations. The southern youth tend to be more decided on what they want to do (2-46).

As with the broken-stable family groups, here too the major differences are in the school record. The northerners have a higher I.Q. level, have a greater enrollment in the Regents program, and have better grades. These differences are not, however, paralleled by subjective experiences in school.

In terms of family background, the southern parents have had less education and are more concentrated in lower-status occupations. As a result of the fact that more people in the household work, the southerners' household income is higher. There are no striking differences on family integration or in the home area.

This absence of major differences, particularly in aspirations, suggests that those migrating North are probably among the most ambitious and mobility-oriented among the southern Negroes. They would certainly seem to be a welcome addition to a community, being little different from most resident Negroes in the areas we have covered.

An interesting area for speculation is indicated by three differences: 5 of the 6 reporting discrimination are northerners; 6 of the 7 saying there is a good chance of feeling in a dead end in ten years are northerners; and a higher percentage of the northerners dislike Elmira and would not like to stay. It would seem that, despite the absence of a higher level of aspiration, the northern youth feel somewhat more frustrated and critical. Perhaps this is because the southern youth still have the reality of the South as their frame of reference.

VII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The Findings

Dependent variables. In comparing a sample of Negro high school age youth to a selected sample of whites from a low socio-economic background in an upstate New York community, we find a tendency for the Negroes, on the whole, to have a higher level of occupational aspiration than the whites. This is particularly true for girls, and becomes even more striking when those of lowest-status origin in both samples are compared. Negro aspirations, more often than those of whites, tend to be directed toward professional and semiprofessional occupations. The differences obtain whether we ask what they now aspire to, what they would be doing if their wildest dreams were realized, what they realistically expect to be doing ten years hence, or what income level they expect to reach.

A comparison of occupational aspirations of the boys to the occupations of their fathers shows that the Negro boy consistently wishes and expects to improve his position relative to that of his father; the white boy does so less often.

The road to occupational achievement, the Negro youth seem to believe, is through education. In general, they appear to have a more positive and constructive attitude toward school than the whites. There are no over-all differences between Negroes and whites on I.Q. scores, but both Negro boys and girls are more often enrolled in academic or commercial programs and less often in the shop, art, and home economics programs than are the white boys and girls. Moreover, a higher proportion of Negroes are in the Regents (college preparatory) program, and fewer Negroes have dropped out of school prior to graduation. Significantly more Negroes intend to apply and hope to go to college,[14] and more succeed in doing so: Of the 20 Negro graduates, 7 are currently attending college and 2 are in nurse's training, compared to 2 college students among the 12 white graduates. The only finding running in a contrary direction is in actual performance: While the Negro students enrolled in the Local (non-college preparatory) program did get better grades than the white students, the reverse was true for those in the Regents program.

These trends are supported by the more subjective responses. The Negroes recall having had more guidance meetings, report seeking out the advice of teachers more often, and more often see teachers as interested in the future of their students. Finally, significantly fewer Negro youth report having done as well as they could have in school, though our data demonstrate that this is not the case. Evidently they expect more of themselves.

The tendency of Negroes to have no lower and possibly higher occupational aspirations than the low-status whites in our sample, and their more adequate orientation toward and performance in school, are not reflected in a more successful experience in the job world. On the contrary, the range of industries and occupations in which the white youth have worked is broader. The Negro youth tend to rely more often than the whites on friends and relatives -- who have poor jobs -- for job contacts. The wage rates of the Negroes are lower.

The Negro girl stands out as being negative about the Elmira community. Though most respondents seem to feel rooted in the community, the critical patterns of Negroes and whites differ: the white youth, when they complain, refer primarily to the lack of recreational facilities for youth; the Negroes emphasize the limited job opportunities, with some implication that this is particularly true for Negroes.

Background factors. The Negro youth come from outside Elmira more often than the whites, almost half their parents being southern. Almost all of the Negro youth, however, have lived in Elmira five years or more. The total Negro household income is no less than that of the whites, but this is because Negro women work more often. Negro fathers earn less, being on the average in occupations of a lower status than are the white fathers in even this poorest sample of the white community, and they are less mobile occupationally. The Negro parents, likewise, have less education than the white parents, though those who did get to high school more often went on to graduate than did the white parents. In other words, the Negro youth more often has a relatively unsuccessful parent, occupationally and educationally, and one less indigenous to the community.

---

[14] In a personal communication, Dr. Theodore Bienenstock of the State Education Department writes: "I was surprised to find that the proportion of Negro pupils planning to go to college in your study is more than twice as high as the proportion of children from low-status families throughout the state...." Dr. Bienenstock's finding is confirmed by the comparisons between the Negroes and whites of our sample.

The several questions referring, in one way or another, to possible models, produced one important difference between Negroes and whites. Negroes, far more often than whites, refer to people who have succeeded where the accomplishment is based on education. In judging their fathers as "having done o.k." or better almost as often as do the whites, the Negro youth seem to be using atypical standards of success. There is little difference in the reported number of successful people known to the respondents.

The Negro youth is less favored in that he more often comes from a disorganized family background than does the white. Moreover, more frequently both parents are missing, the disorganization has resulted from divorce, separation, or desertion, and the home has been broken at an earlier age among Negro youth.

Despite these patterns, the family seems to play no less a part in planning the future of the young Negro and in getting him started in life than does the white family. While equal proportions of both groups talk over problems with their parents, report their home life as happy, and get advice from their parents, significantly more Negro youngsters report active help from parents in planning their future.

There is only one difference between the Negroes and whites in the physical aspects of home and family life: More white families own both a car and a TV set. But even this difference disappears when the two lowest-status groups are compared.

When comparisons are made between Negro youth from northern and from southern families, the major difference between the groups refers to school performance: The former in each case seem to do better. Further, those from broken homes tend to have higher levels of aspiration on those questions in which fantasy has the greatest room for play (dreams, aspirations on entering high school, not being in a dead end ten years hence).

Development of the Hypothesis

Since this study was designed to be exploratory, we started out with the general hypothesis that Negro youth would have aspirations and orientations which differed from those held by their white peers, without predicting the direction in which these differences would go, and without ascribing specific causes. We can now attempt to examine this hypothesis in light of our findings, cautioning the reader that the proffered explanations are post hoc explanations.

Our sample of Negro youth, as we have seen, tends to have a higher level of occupational aspiration than a comparable group of white youth from a low socio-economic background. The Negroes also have a more serious attitude toward school, as the likeliest channel through which mobility can be achieved. This finding is in line with previous studies in this area.

All attempts at a single explanation of these differences are, of course, insufficient. We should, rather, seek the answer in a conjunction of factors. We would suggest that the crucial influence here is the existence for Negro youth of "models of dissociation." The white youth -- even from a low-status background -- is a member of the dominant racial group of our society. His father has a relatively respectable occupation. There is more often someone in his immediate family with whom he can identify, occupation-wise, and in whose footsteps he can follow.[15] A substantial proportion of the Negro youth studied here, on the other hand, either come from a home from which the father is absent, or have fathers who are notably less than successful economically, as are most other relatives and family friends. At the same time, the Negro adolescent is keenly aware that his father -- like all Negroes in our society -- is by definition, of an inferior status. He would tend, then, to want urgently to escape the fate of his father by being as unlike him as possible, in contrast to the white, who can accept his father as a model, seeking perhaps, a one-step improvement. This process would not merely be related to an absence of role models; it would rather be an active, semiconscious act of dissociation, in which adult Negroes are used as a negative reference group.

---

[15] "Identification" is usually used to refer to the primary psychological, unconscious process central to personality formation. We have throughout this section used it to refer to the specific learning from and emulation of parents and others in the selection of occupational aspiration. It is quite conceivable that a child will "identify" in the former sense, yet in his hopes and plans for the future will do his best not to follow in his parents' footsteps.

The fact that, in our study, more Negroes report that their parents actively help them plan their future does not necessarily contradict the finding. The parents may ardently concur in this process of dissociation, wishing their children to be as unlike themselves as possible. This pattern is frequently found among immigrant groups, and it is not at all surprising that we see it among Negroes.

The Negro's high level of aspiration, however, probably differs qualitatively from the aspirations found among children of the middle and upper class, who identify directly with their parents. For them, it is a "following after"; for the Negro youth, it is a "getting away from."

But if Negro youth do not have personally known models of high status with whom they can identify, many of them have been subjected to another pressure which buttresses the process of dissociation: the traditional stress on great men -- George Washington Carver, Paul Lawrence Dunbar, Ralph Bunche. Negroes, no less than whites, have virtually come to believe that there are two kinds of Negroes in America: the exceptional and the mass, with nothing between. To succeed can only mean to become a professional.

Why, however, we must ask, the intense desire to succeed and to be mobile? Given the values of our society -- as expressed through the mass media and the educational system -- at the core of which lies the assumption that those who are not mobile are human failures, the Negro youth is, no less than the white, driven to get ahead. Over and above this influence, it is reasonable to posit another influence, one which derives from the acute problem of lack of self-esteem among the members of a minority group. To gain a measure of self-respect, and the respect of others, the Negro youth is impelled to remove himself as far as possible from the occupational level of his father.[16]

Thus motivated for high achievement, the specific inclination of Negro youth toward the professions and semiprofessions becomes explainable when we consider one further factor, namely, discrimination. It has been, until recently, highly unrealistic for Negro youth to seek success through skilled trades, business outside the Negro community, or corporate hierarchies. They are undoubtedly aware of the prevalence of discrimination in these areas. (Though not necessarily proof of discrimination, the evidence in the present study pointing to the Negroes' disadvantages in the job world bolsters the anticipation of discrimination.) In a sense, then, it is most realistic to seek mobility through the professions. Analysts of the contemporary American scene, moreover, concur in viewing education as the major avenue for upward mobility from the lower classes.

---

[16] For ample evidence of this pattern, see the stress on society news in the Negro press. In a sense, this is also a major theme of E. Franklin Frazier's Black Bourgeoisie, Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1957.

The Problem of Realism

There is little doubt that the aspirations of the Negro youth have large components of unrealism, in the sense that few will realize their hopes. In light of our analysis, however, we should have expected to find precisely what we did find. There is a pathological condition at a number of points in our society. Most particularly, the confinement of Negro adults to the lowest level of occupations makes it difficult for youth to identify with their parents and follow in their footsteps. Second, discrimination by labor unions and corporations closes the door to channels of moderate mobility for youth starting out. And third, the religion of success central to our value system inevitably brings failure to the many. These three considerations suggest the need for major social changes as a prerequisite for the resolution of the problems posed by the occupational aspirations of Negro youth.

Yet this is not the whole problem. Thirty-seven of the Negro youngsters indicated that they intended to apply for admission to college or had already done so. All but 5 of these hoped to go if admitted, and 7 are already in college. But an optimistic analysis of the I.Q. scores and high school records of the remaining 28 (no records were obtainable for 2 students) shows that only 8 could probably be admitted to college, another 8 might be, while it is highly unlikely that 12 had the prerequisites for college attendance. Nor do these prospects take into account the financial problems of college attendance or such vicissitudes of life as the draft and marriage.

Similarly tenuous are the chances for achieving professional and semiprofessional careers by the 33 Negro youth who aspire to them. Almost without exception such positions require post-high school training with prerequisites of adequate performance in high school. There is no a priori absurdity in an American youngster's wishing to be a nurse, teacher, medical technician, or social worker. On the contrary, our society needs them badly. But if the youngster is not to suffer frustration, he must have both the talent and formal prerequisites for training in his chosen field. We have no data (other than the I.Q. scores) on the potentials of these 33 youth. Analysis of their high school performance, however, indicates that a majority are most unlikely to realize their hopes. Again being optimistic, we used high school records to sort out those who had a fair chance of entering the professional occupation of their choice -- of these there were 7; 12 were in the questionable category; while 14 stood little or no chance of becoming professionals or semiprofessionals.

It may be that the statements of high aspirations derive in part from an attempt to impress the middle-class interviewer. To the extent, however, that these reflected earnest hopes, one can safely predict that few of the Negro youth with high aspirations will achieve full satisfaction. One may hope that they have second choices that will provide a measure of satisfaction.

Though it may be too late to help the members of our sample realize their primary goals, the implications of these findings for future classes are significant. This is not the place for detailed suggestions for guidance counselors and others in positions of possible influence. Yet it is important that findings not be misread to suggest that those in a position to advise and assist Negro youth should press solely toward lower levels of aspiration under the guise of greater "realism." Efforts should rather be directed toward the early identification of individual talents, toward assistance for channeling efforts in appropriate directions and, above all, toward motivating youth to prepare from an early age for adequate performance.

The Negro Youth's Aspirations

In summarizing the studies of Negro youth aged 16-24 in the United States sponsored by the American Youth Commission in the late thirties, Robert L. Sutherland suggests a useful distinction. He discusses "those who have shared the American dream," "those who aspire but cannot achieve," and "those who do not aspire."[17] The final step in the analysis of our data followed along these lines, though we focused on aspiration alone rather than on achievement, as Sutherland did. In most of the discussion so far, we have dealt with the Negro sample as a group, comparing it to the white sample and attempting to account for the relatively higher aspirations of the former. Obviously, however, not all Negroes have equally high levels of aspiration. By analyzing the interview record of each Negro youth as one document, we were able to arrive at what may be a useful classification, which distinguishes between five patterns of occupational aspiration. Each of the Negro boys and girls studied falls roughly into one of these patterns:

---

[17] Robert L. Sutherland, Color, Class and Personality, Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1942, Chapters III and IV.

1. High and clear: These youth have arrived at a clear notion of what they would like to do in life, their sights are set relatively high, and they have a fair idea of what planning, training, and equipment are essential to the realization of their goals.

2. High but unrealistic: These youth too have high aspirations, but these are disproportionate to their capacities as indicated by school records, or they have little notion of and/or have done little planning for what it will take to realize their aspirations.

3. Low-level calm: The focus here is on security, obtaining a slot in life which will allow one to function without undue worry.

4. Unclear but eager: Though about 18 years old, these youth have not yet developed a clear aspiration. There is, however, some eagerness about achievement, a desire to get ahead in life, without clarity or specificity.

5. Apathetic: These youth are already resigned to being passive recipients of whatever fate has in store for them. The possibility of mobility has either never been considered or has been rejected.

Among the Negroes studied, a larger proportion of boys tend to have high but unrealistic aspirations, whereas more girls accept low-level calmness or are apathetic. Perhaps surprisingly, no more than 11 of the Negro boys and girls are apathetic. On the other hand, 17 have high and clear aspirations, and 13 have high but unrealistic aspirations. Another 6 are unclear but eager, and 14 manifest a low-level calmness.

The nature of these five types may be seen more clearly by the presentation of two concrete cases for each. It should not, however, be inferred that the background factors presented in each case are typically causal; the question of causality is discussed below.

1. High and clear

R. E. is a 17-year-old lad still in school. He lives at home with his northern-born parents, both of whom are semiskilled workers. The home, as

> he describes it, is comfortable and happy, and he seems close to his parents. Though he sees his father as successful, he hopes to do better. He would like to do "social work of some sort," and is aware that his athletic success in high school is inadequate to assure him a career. He definitely plans on attending college, and both his grades and the financial position of his parents would seem to present no obstacle, though he is not an outstanding student. He has received advice from his teachers, and feels that they are interested in him. Most problems are discussed with his parents, and they have been actively helpful in planning his future.
>
> L.O. is a 19-year-old girl now attending college who is clearly intent on having a professional career. She seems to be highly motivated and ambitious. Her parents, both high school graduates, are employed, her father as a skilled worker, her mother as a service worker. Though she describes her home as stable and happy, this does not seem to be the case. Other sources report her father as not living at home and indicate substantial family conflict. She is the oldest of five children. Her specific aim is to be a history teacher, but her dream is to be a director of a teaching center in Africa for all races. Her high school record is adequate, and her present college has a respectable standing. Originally wanting to be a secretary, she adopted her present goal under her mother's influence, and reports substantial contact with and interest by teachers. She also reports knowing several people whom she considers successful and whom she admires.

There is no perceptible reason why R.E. and L.O., as well as many of the others in this category, should not reach reasonable approximations of their objectives. The central ingredient which might lead to frustration is inadequate help and advice in the preparation for their careers.

2. High but unrealistic

A.U., who says "I don't want to be like anyone else" when asked about models, is 18 and still in school. His mother died when he was about 12, and he then lived with foster parents. His parents were from the South, with little education, and his father was a janitor. His present home is quite poor. Though not unintelligent, his high school record is poor: "Things just come hard for me." He nonetheless wants to go to college very much, and aspires to be a veterinarian. This is not only a dream; he says this is what he expects to be. His second choice is an electronic technician. He chooses public recognition and service to humanity as the hallmarks of a good job. His foster mother, who runs the home, has helped him plan things, and teachers have been helpful about "trouble at home." There is, however, no indication that he has any idea of how one goes about becoming what he would like to be.

S.H. would like to be a child psychologist, since she enjoys children. Her interest has shifted to this from interior designing. Her home is stable and matriarchal. Her father is an unskilled, poorly educated southerner, while her mother, who was raised in Elmira and graduated from high school, is a semiskilled worker. Her older sister is a practical nurse who she feels has been successful. She claims she has decided exactly what she wants to do. Yet her high school record is poor, and she took a commercial and home economics course. She is one of the few girls who said they wanted a career, but says she will "probably be married" when asked about her probable activity ten years hence.

There is little likelihood that youngsters like A.U. and S.H. will achieve their aspirations. We cannot tell from the interview record how seriously they hold them, or what alternatives they have in mind, if any. What does seem clear is that without a shift to a more realistic aspiration, guided by sound advice and attuned to the capacities of the individuals, frustration is bound to develop.

3. Low-level calm

> A.W., a 23-year-old serviceman, came North with his mother when he was 16. His parents were poorly educated, working as laborer and service worker respectively. He dropped out of school shortly after his arrival in Elmira, having done poorly, and entered the Navy. Unhappy as a child, he went his own way, receiving no advice and having no models. He has since married, and has three children. He acquired a skill in the service and, on completion of his second hitch, plans to continue in this work. At one time he wished to become a salesman, but now has found his niche and sounds satisfied. Responding to the list of occupations offered, he says he would like being a barber, mailman, salesman, or cook. His dreams coincide with his present activity and his future expectation. College is, of course, irrelevant to his plans.
>
> A.R., now 17 and at school, lives with her father, older brother, and younger sister. Her mother left home when she was about 7. Her parents are relatively well educated; her father attended college and is now a skilled worker. She reports her home as somewhat unhappy, but anticipates advice and help from her father. There has been little planning -- either with parents or teachers -- in her life. Though she says she would very much like to go to college, her grades in school do not warrant this. She is a commercial major, and would like to become a stenographer. She dreams of being well known in the business world, but expects to be doing some office work as a career. She reports knowing no one whom she considers successful or whom she admires.

There is little reason to think that young people like A.W. and A.R. will not find their niches in life, assuming they encounter no flagrant discrimination. They ask little of life but security and a self-respecting stable occupation.

4. Unclear but eager

I. L. is a high school graduate. He lives with his parents and two younger sisters. The family, stemming from the South, moved to a large northern city before coming to Elmira. His father, who had little education, works as a janitor. His mother's part-time service occupation supplements the family income. She is a high school graduate. I. L. is close to his family, receives their help and advice in planning his future. College is not a serious consideration, though he says he would like to get further business training. For the present, he works in a retail shop. He thinks he would like to enter the same line of business, and dreams of owning his own shop. There is, however, no clear plan of action. With the right breaks, I. L. might become a salesman. But he has no clear idea of what he will be doing ten years hence. He just knows he wants to advance; this is why Elmira, though "a fine small town," is not for him.

E. R., now 20 and a high school graduate, is an angry girl. She is one of the few who complained about discrimination in school. She lives with her parents and an older sister. Her parents, who are northern, attended grade school. Her father is a janitor, and the family is poor. Her high school record is on the inferior side, and she has given up the idea of going to college, though she feels badly about it. She worked for a year as an elevator operator but quit because of the pay, and has not worked since. She vaguely refers to being a social worker, but seems aware that this is nothing concrete. She thinks there is a good chance of feeling in a dead end ten years hence. She has, however, not become apathetic. She feels she can count on her mother, older siblings, and Negro community leaders for advice, but thus far has evidently not obtained much help.

These youth represent a group who, without guidance and assistance, are probably doomed to drift into dead-end positions, creating bitterness for them and a loss to the community. Were they white, some could count on receiving lucky breaks. Whatever the reason, they do not seem to be capable of making the breaks for themselves, or of adequate planning for their futures.

5. Apathetic

O.N. is a relatively inarticulate 18-year-old boy who dropped out of school because all his friends were doing so. "They wanted to earn some money and so I thought I wanted to earn some too," he says. He had some experience in school with drafting, and this is his dream; but his is clearly the fate of a drifter. Though his father left home when O.N. was about 11, the family income is adequate thanks to the work of several older brothers. His parents were both southern and had some grade school. Family relations seem to be rather loose and haphazard, with no planning, advice, or help anticipated. He is one of the few who doubts that he would go to high school if the choice were his, for he sees no point in it. Obviously, he does not care about college, and sees his future as "marching" in the army. He has not worked since leaving school. He expresses no interest in any of the occupations suggested to him by the interviewer. Despite the fact that his father is an unskilled laborer, O.N. does not feel that he will make out as well.

L.A. is a 20-year-old girl, one of a large family, whose mother left home when she was 12. Her father, a southern migrant and formerly a coal miner, is now a service worker in a large retail establishment. She sees him as "kind of mean; that sums up everything." Nonetheless, she feels she can count on him for help and planning. But she has no particular ambition. A poor student of low intelligence, she dropped out of school because she did not like it and in order to help her family. She then took an unskilled job in a factory, where it is likely that she will remain until she starts raising a family. "There are so many things that I wanted to do," she says, though without specifying anything, "and had to change my mind, that there is no one thing that I'd like to be like." An indication of her apathy is the low figure of $60 she sees as her family income ten years hence.

The apathetic people, though relatively few in number, are clearly furthest removed from any version of the American Dream. They have been beaten before they started. Possibly the girls will derive satisfaction from their homes, but the boys will drift from job to job, resignedly. Here is a type of person lost to society -- and to himself.

* * * *

Without life-history depth interviewing by highly skilled interviewers, it is manifestly impossible to determine the causes behind the different paths of development taken by these youth. Analyzing the available data, it is clear that no one factor is decisive.

One thing does seem to emerge from inspection of the data on each of these five groups. The "high and clear" group tends to have a different background from the other four groups, although the differences are not absolute. This is most clearly seen in I.Q. scores: Of the 17 in this group, 14 were in the two highest deciles found among Negro students (the I.Q. of one youth was not known); fewer than half of each of the other four groups were in the two highest deciles. This group also had a somewhat higher proportion of stable family backgrounds (both parents or step-parents present): 12 of 17 cases, compared to about half in the other groups. This group likewise was more northern in origin, 10 of the 17 having northern parents, and had a higher proportion of fathers who were skilled workers or of higher status (7 of 17). A combination of the first three of these factors indicates the difference even more sharply. Classifying those individuals in the two highest I.Q. groups from stable homes with northern parents as those with "favorable" backgrounds and all others into a second category, we find the distribution among the five types shown in Table V-a.

Obviously, very few of any but the "high and clear" group have a combination of favorable background factors. Even this group, however, has far from a homogeneous background.

From these data, then, an unequivocal causal explanation cannot be derived. It may well be that personality characteristics, a particular quality of family relations, fortuitous experiences, or other factors may play important roles in these different types of orientation. Each would seem to require a different approach of guidance and assistance.

Table V-a. Comparison of Backgrounds

	"Favorable"	"Unfavorable"	Data Lacking
High and clear	7	9	1
High but unrealistic	2	11	-
Low-level calm	1	5	-
Unclear but eager	3	8	3
Apathetic	2	9	-

VIII. A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

There is a substantial literature, both sociological and vocational, on levels of aspiration and occupational orientation. By and large, there is consensus regarding three major conclusions: (1) There is a high correlation between vocational aspirations and father's occupation; (2) There is a discrepancy between the distribution of vocational aspirations and the actual distribution of the labor force; (3) At completion of high school, vocational aspirations have been clarified with relative decisiveness.

The modest literature which deals with Negro vocational aspirations or Negro-white comparisons suggests significant differences between Negro and white youth in this area.[18] Volney Faw's investigation compared 397 Negro to 382 white junior and senior high school boys, all from poor economic neighborhoods. He notes that at every level of the father's occupation, the Negro youth are more interested in professional and clerical positions than are the white youth studied. Moreover, he finds that while whites of lower-level origin tend to restrict their aspirations, this is not the case for Negroes.

---

[18] The studies reviewed here are:
Volney Faw, Vocational Interests of Chicago Negro and White High School Junior and Senior Boys, unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1948; E. H. Fitchet, "The Occupational Preferences and Opportunities of Negro College Students," Journal of Negro Education, Vol. 7, 1938, pp. 498-513; S. Gray, "The Vocational Preferences of Negro School Children," Journal of Genetic Psychology, Vol. 64, 1944, pp. 239-247; C. Hyte, "Occupational Interests of Negro High School Boys," School Review, Vol. 44, 1936, pp. 34-40; Paul F. Lawrence, "Vocational Aspirations of Negro Youth in California," Journal of Negro Education, Vol. 19, 1950, pp. 45-56; P. Witty, Sol Garfield, and W. Brink, "A Comparison of the Vocational Interests of Negro and White High School Students," Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 32, 1941, pp. 124-132.

In a study of vocational preferences of 325 college students from two Negro colleges in South Carolina, Fitchet found that more than half the students were oriented toward the professions, with teaching taking far and away first place.

Gray's study of 797 Negro children in the first six grades in Tennessee and North Carolina -- which he compares to a parallel study of white children -- showed that preferences of Negro and white girls were similar, but differences appeared among the boys. The median occupational level chosen by the Negro children was higher than that of the white children. He reports that the Negro child does not become more "realistic" in his vocational choice with increasing chronological age. In conclusion, Gray suggests that the Negro child's choice of higher occupational levels may be a function of his greater striving for economic security and prestige.

Hyte studied the occupational choices of Negro boys in 12 Indiana and Kentucky high schools. He notes that 70 percent expected to attend college. Despite the fact that only 12 percent of the fathers were professionals, fully 75 percent of the boys aspired to professional occupations. He concludes from this that parental influence ranked low as an agency in the formation of these pupils' occupational choices.

In a study of all tenth-grade Negro students in the thirteen California schools with 5 percent or more Negro students, Lawrence found that 39 percent chose professional and semiprofessional occupations and another 19 percent hoped to be clerical and sales workers. Only 3 and 8 percent, respectively, of their parents were so employed. He adds that 50 percent of the students were confident that they would attain their occupational goals.

Witty's comparison of 700 white and 984 Negro Chicago high school students provides the only note of possible contrast in these studies. While 44 percent of the white and 65 percent of the Negro pupils expected to go to college, the occupational preferences of the whites were no lower than those of the Negroes. In first place as choice of Negro boys was postal work (22%). Both groups, nonetheless, show high proportions of professional aspirants.

Chapter VI

MANAGEMENT AND MINORITY GROUPS:
A Study of Attitudes and Practices in Hiring and Upgrading

Bernard Rosenberg and Penney Chapin

INTRODUCTION

The Problem and Previous Studies

We now know a great deal about race relations as they impinge on many aspects of our daily lives in the United States, but much of a fundamental nature remains to be learned. The document that follows is a first step, one among very few, toward increasing our meager knowledge of a facet of race relations that has not heretofore been closely observed. This first step takes us only a little distance. Conclusions advanced here may seem bold; they are rather to be regarded as hypothetical and suggestive, but better than mere stabs in the dark. A pilot study is meant to do no more than harvest facts and uncover leads to provisional conclusions, which can be supported or refuted, sustained or modified or reversed by subsequent study. Too often "subsequent study" remains unachieved and preliminary findings are accepted as though they were definitive laws. In the interests of good social science and sound social policy, it is clearly desirable to go beyond the surface we have here scratched.

The results we obtained tend to confirm the work of several other investigators, where their subject matter parallels ours. This is strikingly so for a classic in the field, Allison Davis' "The Motivation of the Underprivileged Worker."[1] Davis reported in 1946 on a University of Chicago study conducted during the war years, and never followed up, when a large number of southern workers first entered northern factories. Management in and around Chicago for the most part found the work habits of this group unsatisfactory, because they judged these workers by their own middle-class standards -- standards that were often diametrically opposed to those of the underprivileged working class. "The habits of 'shiftlessness,' 'irresponsibility,' 'lack of ambition,' absenteeism, and of quitting the job, which management usually regards as a result of the 'innate' perversity of underprivileged white and Negro workers," reported Davis, "are in fact normal responses that the worker has learned from his physical and social environment."[2] The postwar attitude of management toward Negro workers in our limited sample does not appear to have undergone any drastic change. Business officials in the interviews we conducted speak more often than not in the same terms as those quoted by Davis.

---

[1] Allison Davis, "The Motivation of the Underprivileged Worker," in Industry and Society, edited by William Foote Whyte, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1946.

Davis' solution to the problem in effect lay in motivating these workers to adopt a different value system by offering them real rewards, a real chance of improvement on the job.

> All this is to say that our society must offer the underprivileged worker a fair prospect, a better chance than he now has, of improving his status. It must convince him that he can secure a better life by hard work, and he can be convinced only when he sees a fair number of underprivileged people like himself getting reasonably secure jobs, a place to live, and a chance of promotion.... He must be given the realistic hope that the game is worth the candle.[3]

Circumstances have changed since World War II. Negroes have benefited, like nearly everyone else in this country, from the present economic boom. Jobs from which they were totally excluded in the past have sometime been made available to them. Government employment of Negroes has become extensive on a federal level and in several state and local communities. But although many prominent businessmen deplore the perpetuation of a policy they consider grossly inefficient, wasteful, and undemocratic,[4] private industry still has far to go. Negroes are still frequently the last to be hired and the first to be fired. Furthermore, they are not being provided with the kind of motivation which Davis cogently contended they needed fifteen years ago.

---

[2] Ibid., p. 85.

[3] Ibid., p. 105.

The persistent view among employers that the Negro worker is not technically qualified for high-status employment, though often a rationalization, also reflects the continued inequality of chances for education. Thirteen years ago Warner, Havighurst, and Loeb looked deeply into the matter and wrote:

> Since emancipation the Negro has tried to use the school to gain equality. His struggle for education has greatly benefited him, but he has not succeeded in his quest. In fact, the school often functions to keep him down rather than lift him. At times the school has been an effective weapon in the Negro's hands, but its skillful employment by his opponents through the years has helped block his social advancement. In the South, with rigid caste controls, distinction between Negro and white education is formal, legislated for, and universally recognized. There are always separate schools for whites and for Negroes. In the North, informal and less rigid controls frequently achieve similar results.[5]

This situation is not static. There has probably never been more public concern about establishing educational parity than there is today. Yet a vast discrepancy remains, and even if it disappeared overnight, the occupational effects would take at least a generation to manifest themselves. This component of an underlying social reality cannot be set aside. American society is all of a piece: we seize arbitrarily and for purely analytical purposes upon one part of it, not unmindful that all the rest must be taken into account for a rounded picture.

---

[4] For a recent example, see J. J. Morrow, "American Negroes -- A Wasted Resource," Harvard Business Review, Vol. 35, Jan.-Feb., 1957, pp. 65-74.

[5] W. Lloyd Warner, Robert J. Havighurst, Martin B. Loeb, Who Shall Be Educated? New York: Harper, 1944, p. 120.

The fragment we have broken off for observation is limited to what certain employers feel about minority groups in their employ, and how they treat these groups. There are two other studies of a related kind known to us. One is a pamphlet written by Jacob Seidenberg in 1950 for the New York School of Industrial and Labor Relations.[6] Thirty-three firms in New York City, Buffalo, Rochester, and Syracuse were studied. In each case employers were interviewed, occasionally by phone but mostly in person. In general, Seidenberg's results, with which we were initially unfamiliar, are corroborated by ours eight years later. Employee and supervisor resistance to the hiring of Negroes is a conspicuous factor in Seidenberg's report and in ours. That this resistance can be overridden by an unequivocal determination to do so from the top is also abundantly clear from both reports.

On the specific matter of promotion and upgrading Seidenberg found few Negroes in supervisory positions. More were found holding skilled positions and still more at semiskilled tasks. He adds: "The situation was explained by stating that the more important the job, the greater the requirements of seniority and skill. Because very few industries had granted free and easy access to Negroes until recently, it was rather unlikely at this date that Negroes would be in jobs of responsibility and importance.[7]

Finally, worthy of mention is a report issued in July 1956 by the Labor Relations Department of the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce, surveying one hundred Illinois companies in all sections of that state. Especially pertinent is the fact that none of the one hundred firms stated that race differentials were considered in determining pay scales and layoffs. However, the firms were selected because they were known to employ nonwhites not only in unskilled categories but also in skilled, clerical, professional, or supervisory positions. According to the interviewers in this study, "It was on the policy of 'no race differential in promotions, lay-offs and pay scales' that all one hundred employers came nearest to expressing complete agreement."[8]

This near unanimity of expression provides our point of departure for probing beneath what is asserted to what are actual governing attitudes.

---

[6] Jacob Seidenberg, Negroes in the Work Group. Research Bulletin No. 6, New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University, Feb. 1950.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 43.

[8] Here's How Merit Employment Programs Work! Labor Relations Department, Illinois State Chamber of Commerce, Chicago, 1956, p. 15.

Procedures

This chapter is based upon a pilot study conducted during April and May 1957.[9] The research centered upon hiring and upgrading policies in selected suburban areas adjacent to New York City as these policies relate to minority groups. It is important to remember that the findings cannot be generalized to New York City firms. The focus was principally upon American Negroes. Data on Puerto Rican workers are sparse because in the outlying districts studied, unlike metropolitan New York, Puerto Ricans are an inconsiderable part of the labor force. Nevertheless, wherever their position threw light on crucial and collateral problems, it was taken into account.

In the first phase of this study, depth interviews lasting from half an hour to an hour and a half were undertaken in four companies at three levels of management. In each case two interviews at the top, middle, and supervisory levels were given by MPI's trained interviewing staff. The questions were open-ended, the results qualitative. (See Appendix C for the interview guide.) To avoid superficial responses, interviewers were instructed to probe deeply into actual feelings for private as well as public attitudes.

The four concerns studied were: a large industrial plant specializing in production for the military and employing over 10,000 workers (Company A); a precision instrument factory employing about 4000 workers (Company B); a company with approximately 2000 employees, almost all white-collar workers (Company C); and an insurance firm comprised of two hundred and fifty people (Company D). All four are located in Long Island and Westchester County. They were selected to provide a fair degree of range and representativeness within our limited sphere.

Phase II consisted of a brief questionnaire, pinpointing five particularly relevant questions. It was administered to seventy-two respondents, in the same suburban areas, distributed among companies representing a wide range of goods and services. (See Appendix C for the questions.) No statistical validation of the findings can be claimed on the basis of this limited sample, but wherever it bears upon what the more extensive interviews reveal, reference is made to the questionnaire.

---

[9] The study was conducted by the Research Section of Market Psychology, Inc., (MPI) of which the senior author was director. The study and report is actually the joint product of the Research Section.

Propositions Suggested by the Findings

These statements are suggested by the study, but cannot be regarded as conclusively proven. They are, rather, ideas which can tentatively guide our thinking or serve as the source of hypotheses for large-scale investigation. They are listed in the order in which they appear in the report. In order not to distort the importance of any one particular finding, this over-all conclusion should be kept in mind: Although there is much ambivalence in management attitudes toward Negroes and Puerto Ricans, the climate seems ripe for change, and particularly for the interaction of an external agency such as SCAD with members of top management for the development of a more realistic policy of hiring and upgrading. Among those members of top management whom we interviewed, receptivity seems to outweigh resistance, no matter how deep-rooted the prejudice nor how complex the rationalization.

1. Even in the most "liberal" plants there are built-in barriers to the hiring and upgrading of colored employees.

2. Given the current labor shortage, opportunities for employment are often created by management's sense of desperation which prompts it to cast about for any kind of help. In such cases, this circumstance is a necessary but not always a sufficient condition for the hiring of colored people. Thus, in one plant, Negro engineers and porters are to be found on the payroll with a very thin distribution of Negroes between these extremes -- and the case does not appear to be atypical. In another establishment, where only clerical work is done, Negroes are regularly deflected from jobs on the grounds either that they are underqualified or that they are overqualified.

3. Executives tend to believe that Negroes and Puerto Ricans are peculiarly suited to manual, menial, and generally subordinate functions. It is only within the lower ranks that upgrading for Negroes can be assumed to take place. There is a fixed ceiling to their realistic level of aspiration.

4. As already indicated, in the sections of suburban New York covered by this study there are few Puerto Rican workers. Where employed they are held in even lower esteem than Negroes, and where not employed they are less likely to be. "Puerto Ricans are pretty itchy" sums up a widespread feeling, which is often more obliquely stated in terms of their "basic instability."

5. Whereas a labor shortage opens up industrial (and to a lesser degree, professional) jobs previously unavailable to Negroes, it seldom performs -- within the scope of this study, at least -- the same function for clerical jobs. An exception is the use of Negroes to operate the

larger computing machines where contact with other workers or the public is unnecessary. The acute shortage of secretarial and bookkeeping help has not broken down the clerical color bar. The major variable, reflected in executive and interemployee attitudes, is degree of intimacy in interpersonal relations among white-collar people. This is especially noteworthy in responses to a question concerning the employment of dark-skinned secretaries, less so for what the responses reveal about this particular question than for what they reveal about underlying emotions.

6. There is a tendency to shift the blame for prejudice and discrimination to other echelons of management or to the employees. A sort of "buck-passing" results. The supervisor's hands are tied because employees in his section "would resent" a Negro, he claims. Top management "can do nothing" because the supervisor has the ultimate choice in hiring and upgrading. The section head can not effect a change because Negroes "are eliminated" somewhere between the personnel department and his small area of recommendation. In other words, where there is no clear policy of realistic action followed through on all the levels of decision-making, somewhere along the line the formal policy of non-discrimination breaks down.

7. In spite of the fact that all respondents interviewed were intent upon establishing the fact that no one was discriminated against in their plants and that, further, whatever the prejudices "other people" might have, they themselves were unprejudiced, in each interview we encountered a well-defined, if variously rationalized, principle of exclusion for Negroes and Puerto Ricans of both sexes.

8. The principle of exclusion is most effective in the middle ranks. Negroes and other underprivileged persons are not only employed but are approved of in the lowest class of jobs, for which they are presumed to be best fitted. For any rung near the top of the ladder, the exception proves the rule, and "the exceptional individual" is pointed to with pride in such professional or technical positions (e.g., engineer, auditor) as he may occupy. There is, then, a generalized image of the Negro as inferior, coupled with recognition of the superlatively gifted Negro whose existence does not fundamentally alter that image. The need for a breakthrough is clearly in the large range between the top and bottom points in the occupational hierarchy, which would probably bring changes of attitude in its wake.

9. The following composite stereotype of Negro workers emerges: Apart from those who are "exceptionally good," the rest tend to be less dependable, less stable, less tactful, less teachable, more slovenly, dirtier, more malodorous, with poorer upbringing than whites, and with virtually no capacity for leadership.

10. Positions of leadership are difficult for Negroes to attain save for those that are clearly and exclusively "among their own." Thus a Negro is acceptable as supervisor of a group of Negro porters, although this is by no means the rule. More often it is taken for granted that Negro workers prefer to have white men as their bosses. The Negro "straw boss" in charge of other Negroes achieves a position which, unlike other supervisory positions, is not open to the top. It is the top. "Exceptional individuals" are accepted in high-ranking jobs, not including positions of leadership, usually because there is a shortage of other qualified personnel and occasionally as "showpieces" to prove that there is no discrimination against their group as a whole.[10] It is likely -- though our data do not prove this -- that these exceptions are typically hired from outside the plant and not moved up from within it.

11. Negroes are further effectively excluded from white-collar clerical and secretarial jobs even when these positions do not involve any implication of leadership. Admission to the ranks of white-collar workers not exceptionally trained or fitted for their jobs seems to carry with it membership in the middle class and social acceptance at that level. Social contact between Negroes and whites is not encouraged at any level, but among clerical workers, where the distinction between job and home activities and contacts is minimal, social intercourse on the job amounts to a real tabu. The tabu, we would suggest, is felt to be particularly strong for these jobs because they are traditionally held by white women who are discriminated against themselves, and who may be particularly militant about their exclusive rights to such jobs.[11]

12. The reason most commonly advanced for not hiring colored workers or not upgrading them is that they are unqualified. If one then asks, "Why do you suppose they are unqualified?" there will be a variety of answers. A persistent explanation is that "Negroes just don't go in for skills," as a vice president in charge of industrial relations put it. Another executive of the same company pointed out that it was

---

[10] Various experts in this field have advised -- and management has often heeded the advice -- that it is an excellent idea to start at the top in matters of Negro placement. It reassures the workers that the boss is not asking them to do anything he does not expect to do himself, and it helps to break the usual stereotypes.

[11] General experience suggests that this proposition may not be valid for a number of large firms in New York City. This breakthrough is reflected in a comparison of the 1940 and 1950 Census figures (see Table 17 in Appendix A).

partly a question of schooling, and then observed, "Desire for professions starts young. It's in the history of the Negro race. They just don't have the desire -- or maybe their parents don't tell them...." The lack of schooling is sometimes ascribed to the lack of opportunity for schooling, but more often it is argued that the Negro is deficient in ambition and therefore does not wish to secure the necessary education and training. Even if he does get the same education, "It's not really the same."[12]

13. Akin to the above is a widespread impression that Negroes move about a great deal more than whites. In addition to the feeling that Negroes "Find formal education much harder to absorb" because "their desire isn't as deep" as that of white workers, it is frequently asserted that "Negroes don't hold onto their jobs" and are therefore inherently less stable than whites.

14. On every level we found a tendency to believe that one reason that Negroes do not have better jobs is because they do not want better jobs. Thus the familiar vicious circle: Negro workers who find it exceedingly difficult to move up in the industrial scheme are pointed to as typical products of "innate" shiftlessness; in spite of the fact that few real rewards in the form of promotion are held up to them, they are criticized for being insufficiently motivated to pursue these rewards.

15. Despite the profound ambivalence that persists in management's mind, the receptivity to full equalization of opportunity seems to outweigh resistance in its own ranks and in those of labor. This attitude is best illustrated in what executives recommend for the establishment of occupational integration. Simply and substantially, their advice comes to the same program long favored by the majority of social scientists, i.e., "Just go ahead firmly and follow through. Worker opposition is to be expected at first. It will quickly collapse if you are resolute." Men with such ideas need institutional support if they are to be effective.

---

[12] The essence of this position -- that "Negroes do not achieve because it is their own fault" -- is not only a reflection of factual ignorance; it suggests an elaborate mental process by its holders for avoiding guilt. Though a number of theoretical analyses of this process have appeared (see, for example, the report by the Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry, Psychiatric Aspects of School Desegregation, Report #37, New York, May 1957), far more empirical study is called for, particularly in the field of employment.

I. ATTITUDES TOWARD MINORITY GROUPS

Personal Attitudes of Executives Toward Minority Groups

Management expresses certain official views on hiring and upgrading. They are uniformly liberal pronouncements. Obviously no executive would publicly admit to unfair practices. Yet beneath the facade of what Robert K. Merton has called "all weather ethnic liberalism" there is evidence of persistent prejudice.

When confronted with such evidence, the executive will attempt to explain it away, and in the course of his exposition he will frequently reveal deep-seated personal attitudes. In an interview the conversation slips from the objective work situation to subjective views of people ethnically different from oneself. With skillful probing a dynamic dimension of the problem becomes apparent. Bits of folklore come to the surface; these in turn are either accepted as fact or attributed to others. In any case no analysis is complete without reference to the powerful emotions (apprehension and ambivalence, guilt and righteousness) that emerge at this level of consciousness.

Several men express an underlying fear of intermarriage. They therefore wish to stop the process of integration at the point where it threatens their "separate but equal" outlook on race relations. The free associations of an executive from Company D on this subject are apropos:

> Q: Where would you draw the line for integration? At intermarriage?
>
> A: That's foolish. I grew up in the North. We shared recreational facilities at school. Integration is not going to mean intermarriage. And so what? What difference is it going to make? I can't see where it's going to mean intermarriage....
>
> In the house next to mine, a Negro would be okay. I wouldn't like to see it happen from a monetary point of view. It would make it tougher for me to sell my house, depreciate its value. A Negro would be a better neighbor than the average person because a Negro who can rise above prejudice would have to be a very high type. One in a million. Of course, there's always the fear that once one comes, more will come, etc. But this is not true of expensive apartments: There aren't that many rich Negroes. Like I feel sorry for those colored

> athletes and performers who make money and can't enjoy it to the extent that whites can, who can't get the housing they want, etc.... Now I have a lot to say about intermarriage. It's tough enough for young people getting started. I would be broken-hearted if my daughter married a Negro because it would make her life miserable. I have a son. I wouldn't like to see him marry a colored girl. Where would he live? He would be facing an insurmountable problem.... All I can say is that they have my sympathy. I'm not completely sold on the idea that we'll ever be completely integrated. Things will improve but they will reach a certain peak and then level off. You couldn't consider the society completely integrated until you have accepted intermarriage, the same as interfaith marriage. It won't mongrelize the race. I don't think intermarriage will ever reach alarming proportions.... How many Negro girls have I ever seen that would appeal to me? The Southerners are using anything for an excuse.

The top executive of Company C bespeaks the same concern: "I think the greatest problem and the one I could never reconcile my thinking to would be intermarriage." When asked why, he replies, "Because it's a hardship on the children in this day and age. Maybe in fifty years it would be different. I would feel the same about a Chinese or any Oriental." When asked about the South he says, "Those people who were against Nat King Cole were ignorant goons -- and there were many other southern people who abhorred what they did. People are moving so much today. You don't make so much distinction between North and South and black and white any more. Time will cure it."

In the same vein a supervisor in Company A appears to fear too much intimacy. "On the floor the Negroes are as good as the whites, but I have to say, when you ask me about a personal secretary, that I have not advanced to the point where I could accept a Negro without conscious effort." A top executive presents his dilemma as follows:

> We've been taught to do a lot that we don't accept in practice. With all this I still can't reconcile my daughter going out with a colored boy. I wouldn't hesitate to go to a colored doctor or dentist. I would't mind having a Negro living on

> my street if he kept his home looking like ours. Why, a colored boy sat in my living room and kitchen. He was on my son's football team and they all came over to the house. Nobody said anything.
>
> Q: Where would you draw the line for your daughter?
>
> A: I wouldn't permit my daughter to date a colored boy. Dancing would be okay. I don't know how to reconcile it.

Sometimes the line of contact is delimited in formal terms, as with the personnel manager of Company B. "I have quite a few friends who are colored. I don't visit their homes or have them in my home. I have had a great deal of business association with Negroes. It's been very satisfactory. Of course, there are good ones and bad ones." The employer-employee or businessman-to-businessman relationship is more or less acceptable, although there are gradations here too. It is informal association that is largely tabu, for there is no telling where it will lead.

The apathy of Negroes is often singled out for censure. Many representatives of management, when setting forth their personal views, find that this is the crux of the matter. Thus, "Too many colored people are not taking advantage of educational opportunities. It's true that they have a tougher time, but there have to be some to spearhead it." In response to a question about the allegedly greater turnover among Negroes than whites in his corporation, one man said, "This is just pure conjecture, but I wonder if it is due to the fact that they are in the minority here? I wonder if they themselves don't try to get into an organization where there are more Negroes or civil service?" The question was interposed, "Why civil service?" Answer: "Security, automatic upgrading. I think it's more their reaction than business' reaction." The following exchange is also pertinent:

> Q: Do you think there is any feeling that Negroes are different from other people?
>
> A: The person himself might feel that he sticks out. It's what he thinks other people think. He has a tendency to have an inferiority complex. He thinks people don't want to talk to him or sit with him. I have a supervisor like that. He's a Filipino, quite dark; he's well-educated. Had three years of college.

By such verbalizations responsibility for second-class status is largely shifted onto the minority group while absolving those in dominant positions.

Sometimes the general apathy and self-consciousness imputed to Negroes are given a specific setting. For example, with respect to union activity: Probably colored people do not go into active participation as much as whites.

> Q: Why not?
>
> A: I suppose it's a matter of willingness to take responsibility on an individual basis.
>
> Q: Why do you think they don't take responsibility?
>
> A: My theory is this: we have over 10,000 employees and only two hundred of these are active in the union. The great majority of employees, white and Negro, are not interested.
>
> Q: Do Negroes belong to the union?
>
> A: I assume that they are members in good standing. I don't necessarily believe it is lack of ambition. It's lack of interest. They're not interested along those lines.
>
> Q: Do you know what sort of activity they are interested in?
>
> A: Negroes are more religious maybe.

Still another reason is given for executives to feel aggrieved about some Negroes: "There is the rare case of Negroes who come in with a chip on their shoulders. They think the law gives them a right to a job for which they are not qualified. But I would say the frequency distribution of such cases is very slight." Again, "We have problems with individuals. The very fact that there are certain laws about them as a minority group gives them the tendency to feel that they deserve more consideration. They feel that if they are turned down on the same normal basis as whites that the reason is discrimination. They don't want to be appreciative of our problems."

These interviews suggest blurred stereotypes and ambivalent feelings rather than unmixed antagonism. In part no doubt they reflect the fact that in New York and its environs tolerance is socially sanctioned, probably to a greater degree than anywhere else in the United States.

Personal feelings about Puerto Ricans were not easy to elicit in these interviews. Questions on this head drew a blank except for one supervisor who, unlike his superiors, stated that there were a few Puerto Ricans in the plant, "Two in assembly that I know of. Their turnover is heavy. They are itchy people. It's a question of assimilation. They have finger dexterity. Some of them are quite well educated. Here again it's the same thing. You can make the same statement for Puerto Ricans and Negroes. You get such large numbers of people. They have difficulty in making a living and have a tendency to move around.... It's hard to get them to buckle down...."

A Company D supervisor appears to see no "problems" in the idea of having a Negro clerk in his section. He says that a neat, clean, well-dressed, and well-educated colored girl would be acceptable to him as an employee. He points out that Negroes have no more body odor than whites, but adds, "You might have a problem in the ladies room." Still, his attitude is mostly favorable and receptive until the interviewer asks him to imagine what he would do if he were promoted to assistant manager. In this imaginary role he seems to acquire a feeling of managerial responsibility for the status quo in his company (no Negro clerks) and thus reverses his position:

> Well, you always have a problem when you intermingle. In the army we had the experience that when you keep all the colored help together, they more or less act the way you expect a colored person to act, that is, poorly. We took two colored boys out and made them orderlies and they were happy and satisfied.
>
> Q: Could you do the same thing for this company?
>
> A: The bad feature is this: When you bring one in they come in in droves. You have the problem of singling out the good ones. You shouldn't hire them if it's going to destroy the atmosphere in the rest of the place. If they are at a minimum, all right. I don't think I would bring in more than three or four.

Among those interviewed is a group that may truly be characterized as "ethnic liberals." An Italo-American foreman asserts that he has no prejudice because "I was over in Guadalcanal during the war and I lived among the natives. But for them I'd be a dead pigeon." A personnel manager comments on Negro applicants: "They tend not to be aggressive just because they're discriminated against. You get a higher degree of cooperation from the Negro worker. He will make extra efforts to be acceptable." A supervisor: "The way I feel about it, honestly and truthfully, I don't care what color or creed a person is if he does a day's work." A more anomalous case is that of a manufacturer who points out: "Well, look, we're in a business dealing with products for partially handicapped people and it's always been company policy to hire handicapped people. You may have noticed a midget on your way in. We have workers with every type of handicap, people who are paralyzed, who have no legs, one eye, the deaf, some lame ones." When the interviewer asks how this related to hiring people with dark skin, he is told, "Well, with that company background, we just don't look at race or anything else. It's just a question of ability to do the job." Finally, this question and answer: "Do you mean that the social handicap of Negroes is comparable to the physical handicap of cripples?" "Exactly."

Since unalloyed hostility is rare (we encountered no "all-weather ethnic illiberals") and some true liberalism may be reported, the prospects for widening occupational opportunity would seem to be favorable. There are other reasons for arriving at the same conclusion, and despite the fact that countervailing trends cannot be ignored, management feelings apparently do not constitute the major barrier to equalization of status.

Inter-employee Attitudes as Seen by Management

Negro and white workers interact on the job, at lunchtime, and in recreational activities. There are various patterns of attraction and repulsion, acceptance and rejection. How do workers reveal their own views? How does management group them? What happens when a white work group is confronted for the first time with Negro co-workers? Or, more accurately, how do the executives in this study view the social interaction of workers?

When workers share the same table in a cafeteria or company dining room, they are assorting themselves in a semi-voluntary fashion. Our interviewers, taken on a guided tour of one company, were assured that during the coffee break they would see colored and white workers chatting and socializing in mixed groups. "I guess they like to eat together," the executive remarked. However, the interviewers saw no such mingling. Negro men and women were observed eating in groups by themselves. A Company D executive contends that "they use the same recreational facilities, they have lunch together, and as far as socializing outside the office goes, I don't think the Negroes are any more interested in this than the whites." What "having lunch together" means beyond a certain physical proximity not to be equated with social intimacy, one cannot say. In Company B a personnel manager, pointing to the harmonious relations that obtain among Negro and white workers, commented, "In fact, I've seen them having lunch together in the cafeteria." But neither at Company B or D did the interviewer see Negroes and whites dining together in the cafeteria. A middle-level executive of Company B feels this way:

> There's socializing in the cafeteria. Of course, the lunch hours are staggered anyway.
>
> Q: Have you ever noticed if they tend to eat all together or in any special groups?
>
> A: Well, the Negroes do tend to eat together, but just as a natural tendency.
>
> Q: What do you mean?
>
> A: Well, they know each other from their same neighborhoods. It's just a natural thing. The whole setup is very compatible.

The "naturalness" of segregation (in this case it is determined quantitatively) also strikes a supervisor of another plant. "They /Negroes/ do tend to group at mealtimes and rest periods but it just seems to be a natural thing. From what I've observed there is really no resentment between the white and Negro girls. And when there were fewer, they intermingled more."

The asserted tendency for Negroes to eat together shades off into allegations of clannishness and cliquishness. Thus:

> I think the colored do generally form more cliques.
>
> Q: Why?
>
> A: Certainly there are some of the colored girls who meet the whites on the same social levels,

> but the colored girls have things in common. They live near one another. They use the same dentists, doctors. Their whole outside life tends to bring them closer together.
>
> Q: What about with the office girls. Is it any different?
>
> A: Well, there seem to be fewer cliques among the salaried workers. Maybe it has something to do with the amount of formal education.

And, maybe, one might venture, it has something to do with the paucity of Negro employees in salaried positions. Another official, asked whether cliques in general were a problem[13] (without any reference to Negro-white cliques) spontaneously remarked:

> Cliques are no problem for me because I face each individual by herself. If she has a gripe, there is a regular procedure to follow, a grievance committee. Negroes do congregate by themselves in the dining room on their own. They come from the same neighborhood and they are neighborly. They have something in common. It's not that they're being snubbed by other girls. You see white girls and colored girls going hand-in-hand, sitting together, going to the ladies' room together. A case in point is the spray department. There are two girls always hand-in-hand every place they go.

---

[13] Cliques of any kind are viewed with alarm by management. To what extent there is timidity on one side and hostility on the other, to what extent Negroes are thrust into cliques and how much they cling together, was outside the range of our inquiry and cannot be inferred from our data. As we shall see later, upgrading is frequently an informal phenomenon, for all the formality surrounding it, and membership in a clique may frequently be an essential prerequisite for mobility. If cliques along racial lines are indeed widespread, they would certainly act as powerful brakes upon the upward mobility of Negroes. Thus this aspect of industrial relations would certainly merit study for a full understanding of the problem of upgrading.

This is the only instance in which a manager intimates that a question may be raised as to whether Negro cliques are entirely voluntary, only to affirm that they are. To gain full insight into this delicate area, we would have to know how workers themselves feel about their relationship.

Executives state over and over that there is resistance in some segment of the work force when Negroes are first introduced. It is initial resistance which usually disappears, but sometimes persists. "There are some people who just prefer not to work with Negroes, and of course, it's not hard to understand if a unit head has four people who are good, he would hesitate to upset things by bringing someone in who might cause resentments and grumblings." Or, "You just don't want anyone who's going to cause trouble." What kind of trouble? "Oh, the trouble you usually get. They use the same facilities, and there wouldn't be any point to it if the white girls wouldn't talk to them, mix with them, go to lunch together." Or, "With the present thinking today, it will be five or ten years before you might not have some objection /to Negroes/ from the staff."

Looming large among the causes of initial resistance is the feeling that the Negroes are dirtier than whites, and consequently that their presence in close quarters would be objectionable. In Company C the supervisor says that there was a "certain feeling" about Negroes at first. White girls had certain prejudices in their minds. What prejudices? "Like, they're not too clean. They have a bad odor. But these ideas were dispelled once they started working -- and there was no violent reaction even in the beginning." From a top Company A executive: "Well, there is a certain odor about Negroes, that may be objectionable, depending on how clean they are. But there is a detectable odor. But most people didn't give any reason for objecting to Negroes. They just said, 'I don't want a Negro in here.' Lots of them threatened to quit, but nobody did." Asked whether he had heard anything about the early reaction to Negroes, a personnel manager said, "Well, just one complaint. They didn't like sitting next to them. The one complaint was about body odor." The president of another concern, asked what his supervisors had to learn about Negroes, replies, "One thing that stands out in my mind is that they had to be shown that colored people did not smell worse than whites. Of course, anyone who's dirty smells, but there's nothing peculiar about the odor of colored people." The issue of body odor seemingly agitates workers much more than management, whose spokesmen frequently pooh-pooh its importance. Two quotations are fairly typical:

> B.O. is a reason, a front. Naturally, in a factory, and it's true of white people, too, males and females. If people want to keep clean they can avoid this. I've had trouble with some of the white people who use perfume instead of the

> scrub brush. They'll try any camouflage. It has not been a problem with the colored people here. However, there are physical problems. Sometimes females have problems that are difficult to control.... [but] I don't know of any problem that can't be conquered.
>
> We've had body odor complaints all right from both Negroes and whites. There have never been any arguments about it. There are very few such cases and then the girls really are dirty. There's one from Norway always picking her nose. She's a little backward but she's still here. We have a nice way of handling it. A nurse tells her in a roundabout way without hurting anyone's feelings.[14]

The gradual acceptance of Negro co-workers is tempered by continued exclusion off the job. Much of this is accounted for by management in terms of residential segregation. Hence, "Yes, I was here when the first Negro woman was hired by the Credit Department. The reaction was favorable. She was accepted. She was very nice. I still know her. She lives around here.... There are several Negro communities within a ten-mile radius of this place." In the following exchange with an executive of Company D considerable light is shed on the question of social distance:

> Q: How do you like it here?
>
> A: Well, everyone lives in [this town]. In St. Paul where I used to work, everyone was a stranger. They demanded a little more respect. Here you know your workers socially. That makes it harder. We had a colored fellow working as auditor. He was here about two years. Very nice. He wasn't completely

---

[14] The cleanliness tabu is familiar to social scientists as a widespread technique by which a dominant group prevents participation and competition by a subordinate group, maintaining its social and psychological dominance. In this country it is a tabu maintained both by whites against Negroes and by middle- against lower-class people.

> black, was well-educated and well-liked. He had contact with everyone. There was no one under him. Another man did the same type of work and some girls worked in the department. It wouldn't have been a problem if he had had to give orders. He knew his place. Everyone liked him, even the girls. You know how they gossip.
>
> Q: What if he had gone out with a white girl?
>
> A: The other girls would object to the white girl if she went out with him. I don't think they mix socially. You have to draw the line. They brought their own friends to Christmas parties. They know their place. Colored girls would be no problem. The males would make no attempt to mix socially with them. Most of the men are married anyway.

If the company has a recreational program, there is general agreement that Negroes do not usually participate in it to any significant extent.[15]

> Q: Is there any kind of organized recreation here after hours?
>
> A: We have bowling teams.
>
> Q: Are there any Negroes who participate?
>
> A: No. The teams are only for men.

In another plant:

> Q: What about your sports program? Do any of the Negro girls sign up for it?

---

[15] We do not know whether this is actually the fact of the matter, a lack of knowledge by management, or true only for these firms. General experience indicates that the pattern of discrimination in softball has changed considerably. Bowling, however, is probably far behind, since it is only very recently that the discriminatory rules of the American Bowling Association were broken.

> A: No colored girls signed up for bowling. Last year or the year before one signed up for golf.

Another executive, near the top, is rather vague about it, but he recalls that "the men have a bowling team. I don't think there are any Negro fellows on the team." The top executive of a large corporation boasts that 6000 employees belong to the company's Recreation Association but admits that "not too many colored people go in for it." Why not? "Well, you see, most of them come to work in car pools. Now, unless the entire car joins the activity, what can the one who wants to join do?... White people have more cars of their own."

Whatever the rationalization, it is abundantly clear that the Negro's social position with his fellow workers, at least as perceived by management, is still precarious.

Attitudes Toward Negroes on the Job

Management attitudes toward the Negroes' abilities, in the plants studied, are comparable to the positions the Negroes fill. Thus the controller in Company C has this to say about why Negroes do not become supervisors: "The main reason that hasn't happened is the individual himself. He must have the qualifications. Many colored people who are well-educated go into the professions. Then there is the other group -- they become porters -- who lack education entirely. The lower level is beginning to work up but they haven't had the opportunity. So you have the extremes." And another executive from the same plant: "Supervisors all say they are very good or not good at all." Here is the image of the ordinary Negro, on the one hand, enclosed by a system of interlocking negative attitudes, and of his polar opposite, on the other hand, the professional, the famous sports figure -- the two extremes, the not good and the very good. Says a middle-level executive of Company B: "I don't think it would be fair to limit their choice. I don't know why there couldn't be other Dr. Bunches -- lawyers, doctors, engineers." Jackie Robinson is often mentioned as an example of what a Negro "can do."

The job and attitude continuum, then, is broken in the middle. Negroes, while comparable to other deprived groups at a low level of appreciation and universally admired in the role of "the exception," are excluded from middle-class identification. Although "the middle class," with all its accompanying aspirations and attitudes, is solidly entrenched in the Negroes' own class system, the middle-class Negro is not, at present, regarded as equivalent to the white middle class by the white middle class itself.

A top executive of Company C gives this breakdown on the problem facing Negro youth:

> Advise them of this social problem: get out and get into the same fields as any white boy. First let the Negro believe in himself and believe that he is capable. Inspire that child to think beyond the porter stage, teach him love of country, love of God, that he has as much talent as any other person. Respect for fellow man, property, a person's religion. Any intelligent man will accept him then.... They must be taught pride in their appearance, their work, family, community.

In other words, we would infer from this and similar statements, the Negro can overcome the obstacle of discrimination only by absorbing white middle-class ideals, goals, and ways of acting. But even when he has adopted this way of life and these values, it may still not be generally conceded that he has done so. "Proof" that Negroes actually do not have a characteristic odor, that they are as intelligent and hard-working, as dependable as any other group of heterogeneous individuals, may still not suffice to lead to the acceptance of this group by whites as members of the middle class, which, it would seem, is white by definition. This group will still tend to act, openly or subtly, to exclude Negroes from participation in jobs that carry social status in the white middle class (specifically, any position of leadership and white-collar clerical jobs of all kinds).

Negroes are not considered to have the middle-class virtue of dependability:

> They are not so dependable, you know; sometimes they just stay out and when you call them up they say they didn't like it or they have another job. They don't even bother to let you know.
>
> In fact, as far as I've found there's only one problem -- there are a lot of resignations. They don't stay too long.
>
> As I said, the only thing is their attendance record is worse -- why I don't know -- it's odd -- and of course that's considered an important qualification and part of a job.

This unreliability, in turn, is considered to be related to background education:

> Negroes gravitate to porter jobs. Why? They don't have the desire, from their home or their education.
>
> Home life has a lot to do with it. The colored boy is more inclined to go along with the crowd. He has less initiative.

In trying to explain why Negroes in his plant were porters, a personnel executive of Company B said: "I think it's primarily on the basis of education. We have very technical products here. For a person to get high he's got to have the ability to learn, to go out and get things, they have to be active in outside affairs."

But although education is often cited as a cure-all for Negroes there is an underlying doubt as to the Negro's ability to absorb learning:

> Groups of people will have different personality traits, and although I wouldn't point a finger and say 'your I.Q. is lower than anyone else's' -- don't you suppose you might find a difference in the scores between colored and middle-class white people?[16]

And this on why Negroes don't participate in a plant education program:

> They may find it difficult to absorb; their desire isn't as deep.

And others:

> They just swim with the crowd but they don't get it.

---

[16] For the latest, most authoritative scientific statement on this matter, see the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith Research Reports, "Intelligence of the American Negro," Vol. 3, Nov. 1956.

> They might be exposed to the same education but they don't get it.
>
> A young white boy has a higher scholastic average than a Negro at the same age.

Education, however, has other values for Negroes, according to these white executives: "You take an educated Negro, they're terrific. They're polite and diplomatic, they work hard." "Like take your education -- generally the more education they get the less domineering they are, more humble." And of the educated colored auditor at the D firm: "It wouldn't have been a problem if he had had to give orders -- he knew his place." Education, in other words, is useful to the Negro in terms of personality traits.

Some Negroes who were hired as "examples of non-discrimination" have acquired such valuable traits without benefit of formal education: "Every time you see him he has a smile on his face. He has a very sweet disposition." The white attitude toward those who spearhead integration is that they must not "rock the boat" -- the Negro himself must function as a shock-absorber: Those hiring Negroes "must select people who have a nice personality and will not fly off the handle if people make remarks." The emphasis is on humility and a sweet, submissive disposition. This factor is operative in hiring at the lowest level as well as in upgrading to supervisory positions. "You haven't mentioned the most important thing," says a personnel executive, "...to supply your company with desirable employees that can work together, that are congenial, that don't make a lot of trouble for the company. It may be that colored people might develop traits that are undesirable." Outstanding among these undesirable traits is what is spoken of as "personality" or the lack of "ability to get along with other people."

Any difficulty in "getting along with other people" and forming part of an integrated work force is thought by some to be the fault of the individual Negro and his tendency to form "cliques": "At times a problem can be created if you have a small department. It's more difficult for them as individuals to acclimate themselves in smaller groups." "Negroes clique as much as anybody else, if not more so. That's the bad thing about them. We had a situation here with a large percentage of Negroes. It was getting hard to handle. Only a few bad apples spoil the barrel."

A few executives take the attitude that discrimination is simply traceable to the Negro himself:

> It is not true that Negroes have to be better qualified than whites. They take advantage of their minority group status. Everything is a "matter of discrimination." Now there's one type of Negro we won't hire. I say Negro because he's more often Negro than white, and that's the one who comes in with a chip on his shoulder. You know, the Negro who turns the least little things around to serve his own ends. Such people are their own worst enemies. They become the worst problem if you hire them.

There was some discussion as to the advantages of small groups over large groups, and vice-versa, with no prevailing opinion except that, no matter how excellent the Negro who initiates an integration program, there is always the fear that the proportion of Negroes to whites will get out of control, and the minority become the majority:

> The bad feature is this: when you bring one in, they come in droves. You have the problem of singling out the good ones.
>
> A Negro would be a better neighbor than average because a Negro who can rise above prejudice would have to be a very high type. One man in a million. Of course, there is always the fear that once one comes in, more will come.

Being "one man in a million" or simply having a good education is no insurance that the doors, particularly for clerical jobs, will automatically open. Some personnel executives feel that there is such a thing as too much education: "Then he sent me a man who was too heavy. I couldn't use him. 'Too heavy' means too good. I'd have had to give him a unit head's job and I didn't have one open." And from a supervisor of clerical workers in the same plant: "The girls that come in are bookkeepers. I'd put them on typing. If you put them on a better job -- you'd have resentment."

The relationship of fear of intermarriage to the hostility against Negroes in clerical positions was not gone into deeply here. It could well bear further study, however, because the social organization among white-collar workers seems to be an important factor in maintaining a "closed shop" against Negroes, especially in offices employing mostly women.

The attitude that Negroes make poor supervisors and are not acceptable in positions of leadership is widespread. Negroes are thought to prefer whites in positions of superiority. "At this stage of the game we couldn't hire a Negro adjustor. I think a white adjustor can handle Harlem better than a Negro. The Negro is more apt to accept the adjustor's version from the white man than from the colored. They wouldn't pay the Negro the same respect."

Negroes, like Puerto Ricans, are considered to be particularly adapted to work requiring manual dexterity, the cheerful way of saying that these groups can be put to dull, monotonous jobs more easily than white males: "We have quite a few colored workers in another operation which is not the same level as clerical work -- collating machines. They are particularly suited to that, it's a question of manual dexterity." But such "good qualities" as manual dexterity coupled with the ideal submissive, always-smiling personality serve merely to lighten the guilty burden of discrimination and real prejudice that seem to be still present in nearly all the members of management who were interviewed. The unspoken attitude -- toward all but the "exceptional person" -- follows these lines: "The bad ones are casual, careless, slow, hard to train, don't comprehend...." Therefore, if a Negro is not immediately recognizable as "exceptional," he or she is confronted with an evaluation of himself or herself at the most negative group level.

Attitudes Toward Puerto Ricans on the Job

In summarizing and analyzing the feelings about Puerto Ricans as employees two facts stand out: First, that the attitude is negative; second, that there are relatively few Puerto Ricans working outside the heavily populated New York City areas where most of them live.

Of the companies which responded that they had few or no Puerto Rican employees, these replies were given: From a Company D supervisor: "It's true we have no Puerto Ricans, but I think there are no Puerto Ricans in /this city/." A Company A supervisor's answer runs along the same lines: "So few...mainly because it's a question of transportation." Again, "there are no Puerto Ricans /here/."

But would they hire Puerto Ricans if they applied, if it were convenient? In theory, yes -- "There is absolutely no restriction in this place from a nationality angle," again from Company D. In practice? Yes, but --. Here the reservations begin:

"By and large they are not as acceptable as other people. They don't seem to be as good employees. They're just not dependable. There was a lot of absenteeism with them in their 30-day trial period" -- this from a top executive of Company A. "Puerto Ricans are terribly dirty [dirtier than the Negroes]. They smelled. They also tend to be more clannish" -- from a middle executive of the same company. "Too many demands from Puerto Ricans," a Company D supervisor says in reporting the experience of another firm. "They were hired as cheap labor. Started demanding the company send the bus down to where they lived; next they wanted the bus to tour instead of making one stop; next thing -- whole thing ended up in a bust. Strong impression we all got was that the demands of the Puerto Ricans were too great."

There is also the language barrier -- cited by most as the reason for not hiring or keeping Puerto Rican employees. "The language difference is a limiting factor," says a supervisor with Company A. So does a middle executive of the same company, explaining why only three to five were hired of the many that applied during a certain period: "Most of the others couldn't speak English; that was an immediate barrier."

On the other hand, a supervisor in Company A said this in answer to whether the language problem was serious:

> I don't think so. In fact, sometimes you find that people who lack English speech do much better because they really concentrate on their work and this work takes a lot of concentration. If I can get it across to them, I'm all for hiring such people.... I have a lot of patience with people with language problems. It just takes a little longer for them to learn. I get interpreters and they get it across to the instructors. Most of the time we've been pretty successful. We put in a tremendous amount of time with them.

Puerto Ricans at the supervisory level are a rarity, although a top executive of Company B talks of one who became a supervisor. He also adds that "I have known him personally for many years."

Some respondents seem vague as to whether there are any, many, or few Puerto Ricans working for their company. One middle executive says, "Yes, we have them. I really have no way of knowing where. We have some in the cafeteria, I know; I've seen them down there."

As an interesting sidelight to the Puerto Rican question, there is one answer which seems to lump all dark-skinned people together, whatever the level of their work: "Wait a minute, we may have one Puerto

Rican...there's an Indian engineer from India working here and an Armenian, both very swarthy; they have several degrees each."

Since the plants in which we interviewed had little experience with Puerto Ricans on the work force, not much can be said about prevailing attitudes. However, the little evidence that was obtained points to a managerial attitude toward the Puerto Rican which defines him as very much like the American Negro, only somewhat less assimilable, and therefore a bit more objectionable.

II. EMPLOYMENT POLICIES AND PRACTICES

Recruitment, Hiring, and Upgrading

1. The formal structure. It was our hypothesis that the formal rules of recruitment and hiring, like those of upgrading, were not to be taken at face value.[17] They are spelled out in voluminous detail by interviewees who feel that here they have something "concrete" to talk about. But the existence of rules does not guarantee fair play, although it is a tacit acknowledgment that fair play should prevail. We were more concerned with finding out how management really feels and, consequently, what lies behind its rules -- in both attitude and behavior. The interviews amply confirm that preoccupation with rules is often used as a device to avoid discussing an unpleasant reality.

Methods of recruitment and hiring vary with individual companies, responsibility and decisions being left to a wide range of people, from the personnel department to various departmental heads and supervisors. It also depends on what level is being hired -- professional (engineering), clerical, factory (here the union also plays a part). But on any level -- in theory and policy -- the main criterion is supposed to be ability or potentiality or skills, not color or religion.

We find a few unqualified responses to suggest that in certain cases theory and reality coincide. Thus, from a Company C executive: "Negroes are hired for anything they qualify for -- clerical work, typing, machine work." Or from a top executive of Company B: "Our policy is not adverse to hiring anyone regardless of race or color -- just as we have no negative policy toward the aged. We have 40-, 45-, or even 50-year-old workers newly hired. Also quite a number of handicapped persons." (It should be added that these executives were referring largely to factory line-production jobs or routine clerical work.)

---

[17] As Dr. Lang's analysis of the brewery case demonstrates (Chapter VII) this does not mean that formal rules are not to be taken seriously -- Eds.

From this point on, however, qualifying factors come into force. So that a top executive of Company D can say: "In policy, we do not discriminate against Negroes, but in actual operation, local prejudices tend to keep them down."

2. How high can they go? One top executive succinctly states the problem of upward mobility for Negroes in a way that holds true for most of those interviewed: "There would not be a problem at the supervisory level. It would be at the intervening stages. Once he or she had gotten that far, they would have been accepted."

The most important advancement, it seems, is the first one. It is a prefiguration of the entire advancement scheme.

Assuming the Negro has made this crucial step, how far can he expect to go?

According to a number of executives in Company A, he can go quite high -- though not quite to foremanship (for no specific reason other than the underlying, qualifying ones mentioned in other sections). One reports, "I think we have promoted and moved ahead more people [Negroes] than any other company around here.... In six years I've had to do with putting in names of at least three colored group leaders or instructors. I've promoted up to Grade Three which is the highest in my department. I've seen Four's go up to Six and that's tops." (Jobs are graded from one to thirteen.) As another Company A executive put it: "It's theoretically possible to go from One to Thirteen but actually very difficult. You must have the necessary ability. Top grade people are tool makers and model makers."

But how high can a worker move? As high as foremanship? "Oh yes," answers one, "but there aren't any Negro foremen. Negroes have become group leaders, which is a position a grade below foreman," a position, he explains, "which is as high as it's possible to go without becoming part of management.... There is also one Negro floor-lady."

What about higher-level, professional opportunities? From this same manufacturer: "Yes, we have one colored engineer [in a company of over 10,000 employees]. There used to be a colored chemist working here.... He left because of the housing situation." The manufacturer explained that the plant location was practically inaccessible from New York City except by car. Few of the employees lived in the town where the plant was located but most of them lived in the county.

3. Why don't they get upgraded? The answers to this question mainly concerned women and Negroes (and, of course, Negro women). Puerto Ricans were not mentioned by respondents at all and it would seem as if they were so far outside the pale of promotional possibilities as to merit no consideration whatsoever.

When being considered for advancement, women and Negroes share the same fate: Neither group is considered good advancement material. And for the same two major reasons: They're indifferent, and others wouldn't work for them or respect them.

A common response here was: "They don't find the career ladder as frequently as men" (this has all the implications of their not wanting to find the career ladder, or not being able to, rather than admitting the prejudices that work against the opportunity). Another response: "We lose many women for maternity reasons. Others just aren't career oriented." In this response, we find the crux of the reasoning: the feeling that women just don't stay long enough to warrant consideration for advancement. One respondent said she preferred moving up people whom she could count on to stay, so she "didn't have to train new people every six months." And in largely female organizations, such as Company C, this serves to work particularly against the Negro. More than one respondent, in every category, has repeated what this supervisor says: "They /Negro women/ just don't stay long enough to be likely to be considered. The longest span a Negro has been here is 3 years."

In Company C there is admittedly little opportunity for advancement for anyone (although there is a training program and opportunity to go to school to learn upgraded work or skills). But one middle executive reports that, in their exit interviews, employees complain that advancement takes a long time. And from his explanation of the types of jobs, this is understandable. "You see, most of our jobs . . . are simple bookkeeping. It's all clerical work; they have no skills. Some section clerks have been here for twelve years without moving up. Mostly they stick to one job until they get all the raises. Then they want to move but there is nothing else they know how to do." Another factor is that supervisory turnover is virtually nonexistent, so that source of advancement is cut off. In a situation such as this, where advancement is at best none too rapid, the Negro woman is at a double disadvantage. In answer to the question: "What if a supervisor recommended a Negro for advancement?" there was this response: "I would want to know the facts pretty thoroughly. It would have to be someone who would have the ability to direct without offending. If the person was qualified to the extent she would have to be, she would be a cut above what we might accept from the average white girl." And another executive in the same company, when asked whether the job of correspondent was a sort of dead-end so far as advancement was concerned, answered:

> Yes. That's where you stay. There isn't much movement. There are so few colored correspondents, they have less chance. I don't think any supervisor would hold back a colored person. If a person is quite outstanding, the supervisor would certainly give her a chance. She would also have to have ability to get along and be able to supervise

> /with the implication that these are characteristics Negro women generally do not have/. She would have to be outstanding. She would, of course, encounter resistance.

Thus the Negro woman seeking advancement is at a disadvantage in an all-woman, predominantly white environment.

But what of the Negro generally? As a top executive of Company B put it: "They just done't go for skills." Again, in referring to Negroes in technical work, "I couldn't tell you how many go for it. But they may find it much harder to absorb; their desire isn't as deep." What is the cause of this lack of inherent desire? We recall what another said: "Desire for professions starts young. It's in the history of the Negro race. They just don't have the desire -- or maybe their parents don't tell them.... Of course there are more every year in the professions.... The big thing is you have to get them to study." (The implication is that studying is difficult for the Negroes.) Still a third respondent voices the same opinion, that Negroes "possibly have less ability to acquire learning. They gravitate to porter jobs. Why? They don't have the desire, from their home or their education."

Negative attitudes toward Negroes implicitly question their basic capacity to do skilled work that requires training or to perform responsibly and win respect in the supervisory role. These attitudes are in turn reinforced by the status quo of actual practice which keeps Negroes "in their place." Negative attitudes effectively destroy the opportunities for upgrading, and the fact that Negroes do not get upgraded reinforces the negative attitudes.

4. Upgrading: policy and practice. The formal upgrading policy is almost standard throughout the four plants. The policy is one of "qualifications /ability, record/ and seniority." In cases where there is a union, the union reinforces this policy. Of course, the larger the plant, the greater the amount of paper work. Each worker has his classification and his grade, and is free to make bids for jobs that he might be suited for. In other words, according to policy, upgrading is by merit with equal opportunity for all, and in cases of equal merit, seniority is a factor.

Concerning the straight seniority or "bid-making" situations, we find the top executive of Company B explaining: "In the machine shop, we have union contracts and all our upgrading is regulated by them. When there is a vacancy, the notices are posted and the employees make bids. Where there are several candidates who have equal qualifications, seniority comes into play."

This is the procedure of Company A, according to one of its supervisors: "When it's time to advance, we get together with the union -- we post a notice -- people apply -- I don't know who they are -- I pull out the cards for the names. I look at a girl's efficiency, her quality level, absentee and lateness record. If there are four or five people all with good records, I take the most senior -- this is policy. I don't even see them till the end."

From another top executive of Company B: "When a worker has enough seniority he can bid with complete equality for any vacancy, then take the appropriate examination and get upgraded. An individual who applies and fails the examination can re-apply within six months. That makes for plenty of upward movement in the plant -- so much that it's distressing to supervisors who get people well trained, only to lose them."

It is also common procedure and usually mandatory that promotion does come from within the organization. Only "if we're not able to fill the requirements from the inside, then we go outside -- but that's only after exhausting all in-plant possibilities," the Company B top executive reports. A supervisor from this same company says, "We can only hire from the outside in the lowest grade. If we have a vacancy in A, someone from B has to be upgraded, except if there was no one in B who was qualified, then we would test the C's. If that doesn't work, we open bids to the plant. If nobody bids then we are free to hire from the outside. We very seldom do hire from the outside."

This, then, is the generally accepted, agreed-upon upgrading method by which management and the unions claim to operate. What other factors come into play to influence upgrading and tend to make it not so cut-and-dried a procedure?

To implement the upgrading, at least three of the companies have strong training programs, tuition refund policies, on-the-job training programs, and so forth. From Company B executives on various levels:

> There is tremendous interest in training. We pay for an accredited course, so long as they get a passing grade. It's pretty liberal.
>
> Our tuition refund program is for union and nonunion. They can take any course that will benefit them in their positions and we pay for the whole thing, even the books.
>
> We train inside in special areas. We have outlined an elaborate course to create technicians that people can bid for and be accepted. We supply everything at company expense. It's quite a problem to get qualified teachers. We prefer on-the-job training.

And from Company A:

> The worker who wishes to move up can attend schools and take shop courses.

In Company C (where it has been seen, there is little opportunity for advancement, especially to supervisory positions) there do exist provisions for preparing people for advancement:

> We put up notices that anyone who is "qualified" will be sent to school or taught on the job.
>
> How do you mean "qualified"?
>
> A: We give them a test before we send them to see if they are able to do the work. If they don't do well on the test, they can keep their old job and if they pass the test they can train for the other opening.

But who selects the man or woman to go to school, on what basis besides tests are the choices made? Herein lies the possibility of discrimination (conscious or unconscious), because this is one of the functions of the supervisor or foreman and here his personal feelings may be decisive.

The supervisor plays a crucial role in selecting candidates for advancement in Company C. One top executive says: "Progression of people is at the discretion of the supervisor." A middle executive explains it thus: "The department head has to approve it [the advancement], and he would probably recommend the girl in the first place. Each department head watches, he knows what's going on in his department, and he moves them up from within his department." This executive also says that the supervisor has the closest control, does the most suggesting about who gets what in her sections.

A supervisor points up this factor of personal selection and we begin to see where discrimination may enter:

> I have to tell you this: I have to think of two things when it comes to replacing a section head. It's a difficult thing, maybe even unfair, but after all I do have to worry about my department, so seniority doesn't count with me unless two people of equal ability are available and then I take the one who's been here longer . . . but I stop to think "how long will she be around?" I can't afford to have to train someone new six months later. And I like to be able to move a person up.

This is revealing in view of the response from a middle executive of the same company who said about Negroes: "They move around a lot. They don't seem to hold onto their jobs as long." If this is the general feeling, then it is not to be expected that Negroes would be considered advancement material.

At Company B one supervisor indicates how much of a voice the foremen (in assembly, at any rate) have in selection of other foremen. He says: "There's no policy on that. The [foremen] are chosen in several ways. We try to select them two years in advance. We give the seniority list to foremen and general foremen they key the list [grade the workers].

This list is available to all top supervisors all over the plant."

Once the worker is selected for advancement, he is looked on as continuing advancement material. In other words, those who, in the opinion of supervisors, cannot get the first advancement are destined to stay behind. As a top executive of Company D puts it: "At the first level, it is an invitation. We tell the man what advantages there are -- that this is the first step up the ladder. He can accept or reject ... it in no way affects his present job or security. However, if he accepts, the next time he is asked, it means we wait and expect him to go. If not, it blocks our training program." Back again to the Company C supervisor who says, "I can't afford to have to train someone new six months later. And I like to be able to move a person up," and we see the same theory in operation again. In the factory situation, few employees, white or Negro, can hope for a substantial improvement in their status. It is therefore the consistent policy of management to advance only those who once promoted will continue to ascend. Since the Negro is not yet generally held to be acceptable for a middling, not to say lofty, position in the corporate structure, it is often considered a waste of human resources to place him on the first rung of a ladder that would lead him nowhere.

III. PLANT AND OFFICE OPPORTUNITIES

Vocational Advice to Negro High School Students

The responses to the question concerning vocational advice to Negro students vary widely -- from a rather pessimistic attitude about the Negro's prospects to the more widely felt attitude that the Negro's career salvation must come through upgrading himself, through preparing himself for better and better jobs, through being able to take the knocks that are ahead for him in the job market, and through proving just how extensive his capabilities are.

For male students the advice runs toward taking more and more technical courses, preparing themselves to be technicians, mathematicians, engineers, and so forth. As a top executive of Company B puts it: "Anything connected with engineering, anything technical. That's our biggest shortage." A middle executive of the same company feels, along with others, that the technical shortage is a golden opportunity for the Negro. He says,"I would steer the Negro into fields that are most in demand. Many firms that would look askance at the Negro now need him." A third, top executive of Company C, mentions the possibility of Negroes working into "IBM installations; the demand for qualified workers is so great there would be very little resistance. We have two colored men in our IBM section which only has ten men." Still another middle executive, as we have seen, feels that they should choose a profession. "I don't know why there couldn't be other Dr. Bunches -- lawyers, doctors, engineers."

To a number of respondents, it is up to the Negro to change his attitude -- to mix more freely -- to regard himself more highly so that others may do the same thing. From one on a supervisory level: "They should be very active in mixing. Not only socially. They should take part in Student Council plays. You've got to tell them, 'don't feel inferior; take part.'" Then there is the Company C executive who advised brushing fear aside: "Get out and go into the same fields as any white boy. First let the Negro believe in himself and believe that he is capable. Inspire that child to think beyond the porter stage...."

There are several who point out that, for Negro or white, the course of advice should depend on the individual; they should not all be advised to go out and try for outstanding professional jobs because some of them just don't have what it takes. "Those who have certain capabilities ought to attune themselves to what they can do. Not all of them, white or colored, should go to college. Vocational guidance should be determined on the basis of the individual's potential." Another thinks more along the lines of vocational schools for Negroes because "in the middle-class areas, there are comparatively few on a percentage basis that get a college education."

As for Negro girls, the general feeling is that stenography offers the best possibilities, but that they will still face difficulties even though the situation is easing somewhat. There is this from a supervisor of an all-girl office: "I'd tell them all, colored or white, to get typing and shorthand. That gets you in anywhere, then you can look around and see where to go." A Company D middle executive feels the same way: "I would recommend clerical training to Negro high school students if I thought they had the ability to secure and hold office positions.... I'm sure, though, the Negro will continue to have a difficult time. But the more who try for office work, the more opportunities will open up for them." Another feels, "Things are easing up in many places -- so colored girls should be encouraged to go into stenography." A supervisor in Company A agrees: "There's a big demand for stenographers right now and if Negroes proved their worth, the walls would gradually break down."

In office work too, however, several feel that the individual's interest or aptitude should be the determining factor in counseling. To the question of whether office work provided a promising opportunity for Negroes, the following answers were typical:

> I would take into consideration what his or her aptitude was. If suited, I would certainly advise them to prepare for this field.
>
> I believe all high school students, regardless of race or color, should be given some form of business education, at least typing, shorthand, and some commercial bookkeeping.
>
> Yes, if their aptitudes and interests ran in this direction.

One executive, however, is aware of the difficulty the Negro would encounter in finding employment, even were he trained for it. "If they could get jobs here, I would advise them just the same as the white student."

All omit what the pertinent "qualifications" are. But we would infer that generally they must possess the characteristics discussed above: neat, intelligent, personable, able to get along with people. There is in this, however, something of the negative feeling that these are not generally Negro characteristics. Should the Negro student have these qualities, then he would be advised to try for office work.

Several refer to "background": "One whose background is on a plane above the laborer's level." In other words -- no son or daughter of a laborer or houseworker would be likely to show aptitude or interest or intelligence enough to warrant counseling along office work lines. Another mentions the civil service possibilities open to Negroes as a reason for advising them to train toward office work. One atypical response suggests that they are more suited to office work than machine work because "they're a little harder to train than the average person. When they go to school they learn more about office work than machine work." This is unusual because Negroes are found chiefly in machine work and factory production jobs.

A number see a good future in office work, but would caution and guide Negroes about the pitfalls and problems that lie ahead. One executive says, "The facts of life should be explained. Encouragement makes sense if difficulties anticipated are balanced by interest, aptitude, training, and skill factors."

From the questionnaire. The questionnaire results indicate to an even greater extent than the interviews that, with the present acute shortage of office help, there is a real opportunity for Negroes to break into office work. Accordingly, almost all of the respondents feel they would advise Negro high school students to prepare themselves for office work with the reservation that they must, of course, show some aptitude or interest in the work and have the "background" for it. The general, unreserved "Yes" answers follow this line:

> By all means -- we know full well there is a shortage of competent help.
>
> Yes, I think they [companies] are becoming more liberal all the time. There will be more openings for them in the future. This is true in larger offices, probably in small, too.
>
> I think they're just as capable of handling work as anyone else.
>
> Because of the market that exists today, the best market for a general high school graduate.
>
> Yes, because a number of firms that did not consider colored people in the past are now doing so.
>
> Yes. Office help is in great demand. The best qualified will prove the best employee.

> Yes. I believe the critical shortage of office help /here/ due to many offices moving out here, will offer unlimited opportunities for them to secure more jobs as secretaries, accountants, clerks, typists, etc.
>
> No reason not to. There is opportunity for the Negro race in the business world.

(This last response, from an executive who said that he would not hire a Negro secretary because she would present too many individual, personal problems for him to cope with, is evidence of the gap between rational policy and real feelings about personal contact with Negroes.)

Speaking for those who advise against secretarial jobs, a top executive of Company C feels: "It's the least likely place for them -- a pretty high hurdle." Another executive of the same company feels that advising Negroes to consider the white-collar field is fraught with danger. "I would have to point out that the trials and tribulations would be greater. They would have to stop to think about the particulars of the venture -- to choose a job in which, by the nature of their color, they wouldn't hurt the organization. Let's face it, every business is in business to make money."

How much does good education count for in the Negro? Not much, the insurance company supervisor feels. "You might have a Negro girl in Katherine Gibbs /a top secretarial school/ the way Harvard accepts Negroes. When she gets through, her ability isn't going to mean a damn thing."

Some feel that technical work holds a good future for women, too, as hospital, dental, or laboratory technicians. What about nursing? "No, not nursing," one decides. "That's a calling" -- which apparently, in his opinion, is not heard by Negroes.

On the whole, although there are a number of qualifications and reservations and much awareness of the difficulties encountered, the general opinion seems to be that the barriers can be broken down, and that the more Negroes who prepare and qualify themselves for better jobs, especially in technical fields, the sooner they will find the job market welcoming them and their skills (especially in the light of today's technical shortage).

Would You Hire a Negro Secretary?

"Would you hire a Negro secretary?" was an interview question that proved effective in getting at real feelings and attitudes toward working with Negroes. Since we interviewed only members of management or those in a supervisory position, the answers were generally in the abstract, describing the situation in the plant, how "other people" felt. This question was explicitly designed to bring out personal attitudes toward Negroes and the degree of separation between professed attitudes and real feelings of prejudice or acts of discrimination. We asked about secretaries because a personal secretary is in a position of close social contact with her boss and is a high-grade clerical worker; and social contact on a personal level and clerical work were found to be major blocks in the job possibilities open to Negroes.

"I wouldn't call up and ask for a colored girl, but I'd take her... if she were good" -- this observation by a middle executive of Company D characterizes the type of positive response most generally heard. However, most of the respondents would rather not face up to this dilemma -- and do not expect to do so because they feel the Negro girl they might hire who would fit all their specifications would be very rare indeed. "She would have to have twice the qualifications of a white girl."

And so, a supervisor of the predominantly female Company C firm says, "Of course [I would hire a Negro secretary] if she were qualified." The sort of qualifications she would need? "The same as a white girl: personality, poise, typing, shorthand. Appearance is very important."

Appearance looms large as a qualifying factor -- as important as, if not more important than, skills. For example:

> If a good colored girl walked in here today and made a good appearance, I'd just as soon hire her as anyone else.... If you were an executive or department head, you'd want someone who made a good appearance. If she's black as coal you wouldn't want her. If she's homely as sin, you wouldn't hire her.
>
> Assuming she was a very talented girl, well-educated, and good looking.
>
> Appearance, trustworthiness, cleanliness, tact ... bearing and dress, the conduct of the physical being are most important.

Besides being "qualified" in a technical sense (good stenographic skills), several officials said that the girl would have to know the company's type of business. This would involve promotion from within; and if there were few or no Negroes on the staff, the chances of this happening would be rare.

An executive of Company B has an easy out. "We don't ever hire any secretaries. Those jobs are filled by stenographers already working here." From a top executive of Company C: "With proper qualifications, I don't think I would object. She would have to have a knowledge of company policy, several years' experience with the company, be familiar with accounting terms."

The negative answers run from an outright, "All other things being equal, I would *not* hire a Negro secretary," to a response with so many qualifications and doubts that it could be nothing but negative.

The same top executive who said he would not hire a Negro secretary elaborates: "I would prefer not to have a Negro girl close to me. Understand, I'm strongly in favor of having equal opportunity but I do not want my daughter marrying a colored boy. You don't see the connection between hiring a colored secretary? Well, the line has to be drawn somewhere and I draw it at personal intimate relationships." Then come other attitudes from this man which show he believes that a Negro girl could not fill the job anyway. "For my secretary, I'd like to have a very personable, very sharp girl with good habits. You know, receptionists have to be able to figure out a lot of things, how to handle people and calls, etc."

A supervisor of Company A seemed quite startled by the question. He took a long time in answering each question and seemed to be analyzing his feelings as he went along. But the tenor of the response was negative:

> I just don't know.... The functions of a secretary are so varied and special...she knows a lot about your personal life.... Not that I sit and discuss private matters...but she gets to know a lot about you, your family...on occasion she talks to my wife. I just don't know how I'd feel. I guess, even though as I say it's not remarks of a private nature... I think all things being equal -- appearance, ability, background -- I would be more critical of a Negro applicant. I'd put more emphasis on appearance and how she conducted herself than with a white girl.

How about those companies which have hired Negro secretaries? How have they worked out? One top executive says, "We made a very careful selection. She sold herself immediately and she became friendly with everyone. We wanted to get a good one to set an example." This is a limited exception, since she was only a departmental secretary, not a personal secretary.

But as for being a trailblazer and hiring a Negro himself, a supervisor in Company D would leave that to someone else. "I wouldn't want to set myself up as a model." And the Company C top executive also says he wouldn't set a precedent by hiring a Negro secretary, especially since their office is not in New York City where "people are used to colored people. Out here there is not as great contact. In New York [Manhattan], they are accustomed to work with Negroes."

A supervisor of Company C brings up another hedge: that it's really the business of top management, and top management would probably be against it. "You have to start at the top echelon. When you work for a large company, policy -- your programs -- are all dictated by top management. We wouldn't be permitted to go off on some tangent." And from the man who expressed so many doubts: "I guess as far as company policy, they would frown on it."

The factor of a Negro secretary not offering as much prestige to her employer is brought up by a middle executive of Company B. He also voices the appearance factor in more down-to-earth terms:

> The supervisor wants a shapely babe as his secretary and would resent having a Negress, regardless of how competent and attractive she might be. This is a peculiarly personal working relationship. It also has to do with exposure to the public, fear that it would arouse hostility among the work force and that it involves a loss of prestige, prompting questions like: 'What's wrong with him that he has to hire a Negress?' [italics ours.]

In sum, the area of the personal secretary for Negroes is, as an executive in charge of 1500 clerical workers says, "the least likely place for them...pretty high hurdle," and "if the person was qualified to the extent she would have to be she would be a cut above what we might expect from the average white girl." (In other words, her qualifications would have to be of a nature that specifically set her apart from the negative ethnic associations.) It is reasonable to speculate that the executive who drew the connection between hiring a Negro secretary and intermarriage reflected a feeling that is behind many of these negative responses.

From the questionnaire. Among those who answered this question in the questionnaire, the "Yes" answers greatly outnumber the "No's" -- with the majority of these affirmative replies beginning with, "Yes, if she were qualified."

The question is what constitutes "qualified"? Many do not elaborate. In other responses, we find the following words used over and over again, as qualifying descriptions: "skilled...personable...efficient...capable...neat...good appearance." But to what degree of skill, efficiency, personality, or neatness a Negro would have to rise to face the competition of a white secretary with the same "qualifications" is the crucial question. It seems that, all things being unequal, i.e., a highly skilled, attractive Negro secretary vs. a less than attractive, run-of-the-mill white secretary, the Negro secretary might then stand a chance of being hired by those who say they look merely for qualifications.

The acid test, of course, would be to present the respondents with just such qualified Negro secretaries in order to ascertain how quickly and unreservedly they would actually hire one.

We find several saying they "can see no difference in hiring a Negro or white secretary." Or: "Anyone who is good, regardless of color, would get hired." Or: they "don't care what they are if they can do the job."

Among those expressing further reservations, an executive says, "Yes, providing the girl would fit into the group and the group into the girl" -- thus providing the convenient escape clause of possible incompatibility or general social unacceptability for a girl who is otherwise qualified for the job. Another executive adds this: "Because of discrimination problems, however, she must be approximately 10 percent above average in order to maintain her self-confidence without developing undue self-protective attitudes."

One respondent put it this way: "I wouldn't hire her because she was colored but if she were qualified." Nor is there evidence of any others who would go out of their way to seek out a colored secretary. There were those who said they would do it in some vague future, but would not want to be the first. So one official says: "I wouldn't start it tomorrow. I would want it started somewhere else in the organization. If the pattern had already been started, I would not hesitate. But to establish it myself in my position would create too much of a stir."

This seems to be the more widespread attitude. Whether sincere or not, it could provide a useful wedge for getting a qualified Negro secretary into many an on-the-fence organization. If an executive knows that the break has been made -- and with pressure coming from outside the company, he might be able to say he "had" to hire a Negro -- he would thus escape any responsibility for the decision itself. This seems to be what many fear. As one executive puts it: "I would consider this [yes] answer with some trepidation based primarily on a fear of a negative reaction involving my decision to hire."

There is also the executive who couches his affirmative answer in such a way as to have all the implications of negativeness: "In our particular work, besides the usual qualifications, we require a neat appearance and have a fair amount of customers who come into the office." In other words -- it is hardly likely that a Negro girl would be deemed safe and acceptable enough to meet the public in this office.

The one man who felt he would hire a Negro "as a crusader, and nothing else ... because it would help the cause of general things," safeguarded his answer by saying he'd probably start with a "light-skin boy" for clerical work, and one preferably "who was good in athletics so he could join a team."

Those who answer "Yes" -- to whatever degree -- would seem to be the receptive audience to approach through a receptive management which, in turn, if it knew that some of its key executives might not be completely hostile to the idea, might start the ball rolling toward Negro secretarial employment opportunities.

Among the negative responses, many felt, however, that Negroes might be acceptable for run-of-the-mill office or clerical jobs but not for work as a private secretary.

One puts the blame on the public. He says: "No - because of public opinion. The general feeling of the public is very evident today."

The most common negative answers have to do with the fact that a private secretary meets the public -- customers mostly and other people -- and a Negro would not be too well received, they feel, by said public. This is the way a Company A executive says it: "For the position I am in it would be too radical at this time. The position is with people outside and I would have to think of the effect it would have on the people I have to contact." Another official feels the same way: "I just don't think it would be proper. She has to meet a lot of people outside and make appointments for me."

The other major negative factor revolves around the fact that a private secretary is a personal secretary and that, as another executive feels, "in the community in which I live, my personal activities often require the services of my secretary outside of business hours. A colored secretary certainly wouldn't fit into the picture." As one man puts it: "With a secretary, there are certain confidences. You wouldn't feel as free to talk with them or handle them as easily as you would another kind of secretary."

An unusual point of view comes from another. He feels that Negroes might be acceptable for personnel work (this is a rare attitude in the face of the feeling that in areas of "meeting people" Negroes won't do), but not as a secretary because the "position is concerned with policy." (He does not indicate why Negroes and policy are incompatible.) But if it were the firm's policy, he would hire a Negro secretary.

The most direct -- and again, unusual -- answer comes from an executive who says, "No. I just don't like colored people working for me." Nor does he like working around colored people. It can at least be said that there is no subterfuge here.

On the whole, taking into consideration both affirmative and negative responses, it would appear that progress could be made through companies with positively-disposed executives. External pressure in the form of personal persuasion to get well-disposed executives to hire qualified Negro girls as "examples" could serve as points of entry in establishing precedents for total acceptance.[18]

Negro Clerical Workers

That white-collar and blue-collar jobs were differentially allocated among whites and Negroes has been known for some time. It is a truism of industrial relations that for dark-skinned people occupational opportunities in office work beyond the level of porter are severely limited. In production work, Negroes (along with Puerto Ricans and women) have largely replaced the immigrants of an earlier generation. They have achieved a secure foothold on the lower levels of factory life, where their major problem is not one of initial employment but of frozen status. On the other hand, in private industry Negroes are likely to be excluded from clerical employment altogether. Since the corporate hierarchy is such that eventual ascent into the executive level can only be attained through office work, Negroes are effectively barred from ever competing for top jobs. Women and Negroes are approximately on a par as industrial operatives. Both are in general thought to be constitutionally incapable of leadership. But in their employability, Negroes are vastly inferior to women as clerical workers. The common stereotype of women and Negroes (that they are peculiarly suited to dull, menial work) does not carry over for Negroes from the factory floor to the office. In the job world, Negroes and women are completely "visible" minority groups. In the shop, similar handicaps are imposed upon both groups, which ordinarily keeps them from rising beyond a certain point. Women commonly encounter the same situation when they become clerical workers: their superiors are men. Negroes rarely get hired in the first place.

---

[18] We would here reiterate the point made earlier that important breakthroughs have already been made in this area in a sizable number of firms in the northern metropolitan centers.

Why is this the case? Various explanations are offered. The president of Company D, which has only clerical help, says: "We have found that they /Negroes/ are not competent...and they have such a lackadaisical attitude. It doesn't seem to matter to them whether they come in or not, whether they're late or not. There just doesn't seem to be the same desire to do a good job. Why -- I don't know. You'd expect it would be just the opposite." Lower down in the same company, a supervisor is both more candid and more guarded.

> We have no Negroes in this office. The company has some for obvious reasons in the home office -- to avoid being stigmatized for discrimination. We never had any Negroes applying. I don't know why. We just never had any colored girls applying for clerical positions. We had an advertisement in the /local/ paper and we usually use the U.S. Employment Service. We never give specifications but they never send any colored people.

Q: What would you do if they sent you an educated colored girl?

A: I would not employ her. My main reason is that I like to think that as an individual I am as broadminded as anyone else. But I don't know how my workers would feel about it. Because of our laws I would probably refer it to our home office for a decision.

Another supervisor in the firm observes, "I feel that the Negro has been integrated into factory work to a greater extent, on the assembly line. Males are less prejudiced than females."

Some other opinions:

> You do have a problem with Negro clerical help. Factory work means that you are dealing with a different element. In office work, people are looking for a career rather than just for money as in factories. Average help in an office are of that type. It's an easy field for whites to get into. Negroes are either not well enough trained for it or too well trained. Caucasians are more willing to accept the office situation.

Q: Why do you suppose Negroes aren't better qualified for office work?

A: Well, Negroes have every opportunity in this country for vocational training.

I've had colored girls on the production line with college backgrounds. If that's what they prefer, why should I object?

Q: Why do you think they prefer production work?

A: Maybe it's the money.

It's natural that there would be more whites than Negroes in middle-class jobs. They are better-disciplined at home; they consider the future. Home life, as far as parents are concerned, is probably not the best for colored people. The momentum of parents is probably carried over into children. There must be several generations yet before there will be any real change.

In offices, I wouldn't want to comment on Negroes. Prejudice barriers are greater in clerical positions.... No, I don't know why. It's not that office people are more homogeneous. Maybe it's that the average office workers dwell in tightly knit groups that have more prejudice.

We have quite a few colored people in another operation. It's not on the same level as clerical, but it's a letter operation, work with collating machines. Negroes are particularly suited to that work. They have manual dexterity. They're alert. You understand, this isn't on the same level as IBM. We don't have much turnover in collating machines. Negroes have done as well as whites.... The bad ones /Negroes/ in the office are casual, careless, slow; they're hard to train. They don't comprehend. We try to warn them and then we have to let them go.... It's a question of ability in school. They don't do as well in their school work. The supervisors all say that they are very good or not good at all.

The general feeling about Negro clerical workers is that they are either very good or very bad. They don't seem to level off the way white girls do.

Q: Why do you think more Negroes don't apply for office work?

A: In the first place, I think it is reticence on their part. I studied shorthand in high school, and there was only one Negro girl in the class.

Q: What accounts for that?

A: Well, they probably think they can't get jobs.

Q: Would you say that's pretty realistic?

A: Yes and no. In some places they would have difficulty. On the other hand, the N. Y. State Employment Service and the Urban League are doing wonders in educating employers.

I don't know. There is something less democratic about clerical workers.

Of the people we have to let out because of their not being competent, a much higher percent were colored than white. Colored girls come out much worse than white girls on our aptitude tests. It's not a question of education. It's a question of identifying names, just the same as filing.

The virtual absence of Negro clerical employees is thus accounted for in a bewildering variety of ways: They do not apply -- and often they do not apply because, no matter how well educated, they prefer to make more money in production work. If they apply, they tend to be underqualified or overqualified for specific jobs then available; but among these candidates there is alleged to be a higher-than-average proportion of incompetents -- and they are incompetent because of their inferior education, the inherently lackadaisical nature of the Negro, their poor upbringing, and their indifference to the training which is just as available to them as to whites. And if they apply and are competent, it is still not possible to hire them because white-collar workers are undemocratic, cliquish, and being more often women than men, evince greater hostility to Negroes than production workers.

So comprehensive a range of ostensibly innate and environmental conditions would seem to preclude any hope for quick action on the part of an agency like SCAD. And yet the widespread awareness that discriminatory employment of clerical workers flouts an existing state law as decisively as the discriminatory employment of shop workers may have its effect. There is a certain clear disposition among higher executives to blame those on lower levels for the fact that dark-skinned people are not hired, just as there is a tendency for those below to wonder why the higher-ups never send them Negro applicants. Some of this is buck-passing, but in all likelihood much of it is genuine. The situation therefore appears to be one in which pressure from a state agency is just what many executives are waiting for to force their hand in this sphere, so that they can attune principle more closely to practice and thereby ease a possibly troubled conscience. The personnel manager of our largest plant remarks, "A supervisor may turn down a minority group member just because he isn't familiar with such people. But he's rarely adamant. We can usually insist the man be hired if he's passed his tests. This applies to clerical help, too."

IV. INTEGRATION: WHAT MANAGEMENT KNOWS AND WHAT IT DOES

It is virtually a law of social behavior in the North that no one publicly admits to being guilty of bigotry. Correlatively, any person who is asked in an interview about ethnic beliefs or practices is thrown immediately on the defensive. We therefore decided to put a question to all our respondents which would ostensibly deflect them from their own quandaries and thereby reduce direct ego-involvement. The method is one of indirection which implies that though (or just because) the interviewee is free of prejudice and his business is run on a fair basis, he will be in a position to advise others. The question, then, came to this: how do you think an employer contemplating the recruitment of Negroes for the first time should go about his task? How, in other words, can Mr. X, who is far behind you, achieve the same results you claim long ago to have achieved?

Some answers are simply diversionary or idiosyncratic, e.g., "You have to start in the elementary schools." Or:

> Why not one church? There shouldn't be Negro and white congregations in the same church. Maybe that's the way.... Also, it's a matter of education -- without this Commy approach of a minority pressure group trying to make test cases. That's mob psychology. What good is mob hysteria? At times the NAACP is to the left a bit. They have the same approaches in education, presenting their problems and handling their grievances. I want less fanfare from the NAACP.

Besides the hard core of sound advice discussed below, many peripheral recommendations are made. For instance:

> I think what Julius Thomas /Industrial Director of the Urban League/ is doing is a very good idea. They have a caravan that goes through colored sections all over the country with those photographs of Negroes actually performing skilled jobs in the plant. The NAACP sponsors it. We compiled an awful lot of pictures here.
>
> You start with the children, religious teaching.
>
> What you can do is set an example and discourage prejudice we become aware of in other people -- not by talking so much, as you and I are doing -- but over a period of a year, some isolated thing might come up, and then we can do some good.
>
> I think it's a question of greater over-all education with all white people.
>
> If they select the right people to start with they would have no trouble. They must select people who have a nice personality and will not fly off the handle if people make remarks. It has to be the right type of person.

> Oh, no, the first one can't be too extraordinary. This creates a phony atmosphere and makes workers feel, "She's here to show us up." The first Negro worker shouldn't be a "model" employee, just a good one.

Apart from such general statements, the vast majority of responses square with current scientific opinion confirming the efficacy of anti-discrimination laws or of anti-discrimination policy firmly established and consistently implemented from above. That these men are aware of grave departures from the firmness they recommend does not detract from their essential understanding. The degree of awareness about circumvention and evasion of policy is surprising and should also be encouraging. Here is a sampling of what business leaders advise others to do.

> When top management really believes in it, you have good reason to hope that the policy will be carried out. If there is a definitive statement of policy, it removes any possibility of weaseling.
>
> If I were trying to integrate a place, hiring the first Negro, I'd just hire him. It's nobody's damn business.
>
> To achieve effective integration, my advice would be: Make sure the lines of communication between policy-makers and middle management are wide open. If you don't do this, the whole policy will be a failure. The laws are also necessary. Coercion and conviction combine to give you a fair policy. When top management is put on the griddle, it is forced to do some basic things. The individual is inclined to treat his fellow as a human being if he knows, "This is definitely the policy we want." Often there is so much equivocation that such a man doesn't know what to do. With the best will in the world he may still be uncertain.

By now managers feel confident that they need only to be resolute themselves, and that if they are, underprivileged workers will be accepted. Threats of resignation do not perturb them. They have seen that white employees do not quit their jobs just because Negroes have also been hired. Therefore, worker intimidation of management may be considered of negligible importance. Union attitudes are important, but given the prevailing mood, even they can be overridden. When the president of Company B decided some years ago to take merit employment seriously, he reports that the union counseled him to "go slow." He went fast -- and encountered no serious difficulties. There is noticeable resentment among executives who are asked whether they would consult with anyone about such a decision -- almost as if it were an infringement or usurpation of their prerogatives even to entertain the idea of being "other-directed." So a question rather mildly put will sometimes arouse a strong feeling:

> Q: What kind of advice would you give the executive who wishes to achieve integration in his plant?
>
> A: My advice would be just go ahead and hire. I certainly wouldn't go ahead and make an announcement. The company has a right to hire anybody. No one is going to quit just because you hire a Negro.

There are other such statements:

> I'd just hire Negroes and assign them to their desks. I would consult nobody. The worst thing would be to ask. I know what the answer would be. I would treat Negroes like anyone else. That's as far as I think I would have to go.
>
> No sir. Education is ineffective. You'll never change my mind by talking to me. It can't be done. The thing to do is just do it. That's the best education.
>
> The employer who wants integration should first establish in his own thinking a policy clear to himself and his people, a policy of open-mindedness. He should reject any basis for refusing to hire except lack of skills. He should then proceed on the basis of getting applicants.
>
> It's not so much what employees feel. They can be controlled.

The consensus of opinion seems to be that even a determined policy cannot succeed unless it is carefully watched:

> I would not accept at face value a supervisor's objection to a Negro. I'd check to see that she got a fair and reasonable opportunity -- not a prejudiced opinion.
>
> The conscientious administrator would want to check occasionally on why so and so was fired and why someone else was not, to make sure that his policy was being carried out. I remember something I heard long ago that could serve as a motto, "If you want something down the line -- inspect!" I would like to do much more thorough checks right here than I have so far. Of course, the subject comes up informally. So I'm pretty sure of the men's feelings, but I haven't checked enough.

The whole weight of social science research would support this general orientation. Whether and to what extent businessmen apply these precepts is another matter. That they know them, subscribe to them in the abstract, and advise others to do likewise is quite clear. Here then, is further evidence that the job situation is ripe for improvement. The psychological predisposition already exists in good measure; it needs to be more fully crystallized and institutionalized.

Chapter VII

DISCRIMINATION IN THE HIRING HALL: A Case Study of Pressures to Promote Integration in New York's Brewery Industry[1]

Gladys Engel Lang

Among the case histories of industries in which discriminatory employment practices have been openly challenged, there exists a fascinating body of social data ready for study.[2] Such cases hold special interest when the positions contested require relatively little skill and carry no high prestige. Here, one assumes, the majority group might be most willing to make concessions, and the Negro seeking entry is not hampered by the marks of past discriminatory practices which he carries with him. For low education, lack of skill, the recency of in-migration, and a history of unstable employment serve as a pretext and sometimes as a real obstacle to his employment whenever more skilled positions are at issue.

---

[1] For this chapter the author has utilized the files of the New York State Commission Against Discrimination relating to the brewery industry, many magazines and books as well as clippings from the Negro press and microfilms of The New York Times, interviews with representatives of brewery management, brewery workers, personnel of market research agencies, and other individuals who were somehow acquainted with the history of exclusion in the brewery industry. She has also from time to time discussed the case with members of SCAD who worked actively in preparing the case against Local 1345 in 1955.

[2] See for example: Louis Ruchames, Race, Jobs, and Politics, New York: Columbia University Press, 1953; Joseph E. Weckler, "Prejudice Is Not the Whole Story," Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. 9, Summer 1945, pp. 126-139; National Planning Association, Selected Studies of Negro Employment in the South, Washington, D. C., 1955.

Charges of discrimination brought against New York City's brewing industry involved precisely such a set of unskilled and partly casual positions, and one might expect that integration would proceed quite smoothly if only the practices by which discrimination was enforced could be effectively outlawed. One might further anticipate that there would be no shortage of suitable applicants once it became known that a government commission was ready to take up the case of anyone charging discrimination, and that the industry, too, would take its cue.

The significance of the brewery case lies, therefore, in the way in which it permits an examination of the pressures working both to preserve and attack discrimination and not in the advance it afforded the Negro community. In terms of the number of workers involved, the case constitutes only a moderate victory, no major economic landmark. At the height of the busy season the industry in New York employs no more than about 7000 production and distribution workers. Probably the actual number of Negroes employed for any period of time during any part of the year even in 1957 does not constitute anywhere near 5 percent of this small number.[3] Yet before 1951 only one Negro was thus employed; by the middle of 1954 some 128 Negroes had at one time or another been employed as production or delivery workers. They also gained admission to union membership. Whereas before 1953 only one Negro was a member of the Brewery Workers Union, 35 Negroes had become members by 1955.[4]

More important than the economic gain, the case demonstrated the effectiveness of pressures, reinforced by legal power, in undermining discrimination. Jobs in the brewery industry are, in relation to the amount of skill required, among the best paying industrial jobs. Before 1953 Negroes had been virtually excluded from even competing for these positions. Today the right to compete for such jobs, on an equal footing with others, is firmly established. Whether or not that right is employed, and how effectively, is another part of the story.

This chapter is divided into three general parts. In the first part, after a brief look at the facts of discrimination, we attempt, by analyzing developments in union-management relations, to single out the principal factors which historically led to the virtual exclusion of Negroes from the industry. In the second part, we look at these modifications of conditions and the counterplay of pressures in the past few years which have been responsible for a change in the traditional pattern. The last part examines in some detail the mechanisms through which traditional informal discriminatory practices were reinforced, the problems which still remain, and the "lessons" of the case.

---

[3] This is a rough calculation based on estimates of numbers of Negroes who may be shaping up for work at the present time in relation to the total number of workers in the industry.

[4] Based on statistics gathered by SCAD.

I. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

A Reversed Pattern of Discrimination

The existence of discriminatory practices has been documented -- traditionally -- by such rough indices as the percentage of persons in the labor force employed in so-called white-collar jobs (clerk, professional people, sales personnel, and so forth). Inasmuch as white-collar positions not only carry more prestige (though not necessarily higher remuneration) but customarily require more contact with the public, a rise in this proportion is generally regarded by groups concerned as a sign of progress. For the same reasons, ingrained resistances to the placement of Negroes in these positions are usually harder to overcome.

In 1950 the National Urban League summed up the findings from a survey: "There are few industries in the United States which employ as many persons as the breweries and which provide such limited employment for Negroes."[5] New York was no exception. However in the brewery industry in New York -- and also in the United States as a whole -- the typical pattern of employment seems to have been reversed. Apparently Negroes have encountered less resistance to their entry into the white-collar phases of the industry than into the more or less unskilled production and distribution jobs. This does not indicate that Negroes have been integrated in large numbers into white-collar positions. The same report listed "no Negroes employed in production jobs"; one, but only one, New York brewery employed "colored office workers."

Actually, according to SCAD records, there was one Negro who before 1951 had been employed in a keg delivery department and two more had held production jobs in 1951. Between 1947 and the fifth month of 1954 some 128 Negroes obtained employment of varying duration either in production (the brewing department) or in packing and delivery (the bottling, bottle delivery, or keg departments) in the New York brewery industry. The highest number of Negroes employed in any one year before 1954 was 119 in 1953. In that year five brewers between them took on 95 Negroes who had never before worked in the industry.

---

[5] J. Harvey Kerns, A Study of The Employment Opportunities for Negroes in Breweries of The United States, New York: National Urban League, 1951, p.16.

These statistics on the total number of Negroes employed during any one year underplay the extent to which Negroes were virtually excluded from blue-collar production and distribution jobs. Brewery work is, or has been up to now, largely seasonal. A core of workers are employed in permanent, year-round jobs. Another group of employees hold what are called seasonal permanent positions, meaning that the person works at his job during the busy season (roughly from April 15 through October 15) and, if he seeks winter employment in the industry, there are usually a few days during the slow season when he is hired to replace permanent employees on vacation or to assist during certain rush periods. In addition, there exist during the busy season a sizeable number of casual jobs (largely in bottling and delivery) which are filled by the union locals each day from men registered for employment.

So far as the records show, even casual jobs were closed to Negroes before 1951. Since that time it is primarily the casual jobs that have opened up for them. Employment at such a job, however remunerative, does not assure a worker of opportunity to acquire seniority rights in the industry or to become eligible for membership in the union. It was only the combined result of changing conditions and of concerted efforts on the part of a number of groups to achieve integration that between 1953 and 1955 a number of Negroes secured seasonal permanent jobs and some 35 Negroes acquired seniority status.

The facts with regard to white-collar employment in the industry are less precisely documented. Countrywide, it was reported in 1950 by the Urban League that there were "less than 25 Negro clerical workers and skilled employees among the 18,000 or more nonproduction workers." A New York brewery employed 16 Negroes, most of them clerical workers.[6] It also engaged the services of a Negro as consultant and economist. In addition, two Negroes were reportedly employed as chemists in St. Louis and Detroit, while a New Jersey brewery employed a Negro brewmaster (a top position).

---

[6] A small proportion of the total of 2300 workers, yet a large proportion of the Negroes employed in the industry as a whole. Ibid., pp. 16-21.

In addition to these office positions Negroes were employed in white-collar positions as sales and promotion employees. Mostly these people directed their efforts toward Negro areas. In several cases they had achieved supervisory status and were directing the activities of an interracial staff. Other Negroes were employed directly by independent beer distributors, and by 1950 four cities had Negro distributors operating principally in Negro areas and among the dealers serving the Negro market.

The writer has no reliable statistics concerning the employment of Negroes in white-collar jobs during 1955 or after. Talks with personnel employees of New York breweries would suggest that the number of such employees has been on the increase. One may guess that the situation with regard to the employment of Negroes as office workers pretty much recapitulates the situation in other industries. Apparently some breweries have made marked efforts to hire qualified Negro workers; others have neither "discriminated against" Negroes nor pursued a positive policy of integration.

While efforts to integrate Negroes into the white-collar aspects of the industry have been part of the larger campaign against discrimination in employment as such, the fight against discrimination specific to the brewery industry has largely centered around the production jobs in the industry. One thing, whatever the reasons, seems clear: The brewery industry, in its production phases, was until quite recently "lily-white." The groups trying to change the situation charged, in essence, that certain traditional informal discriminatory practices were being reinforced and formalized by a union-management collective bargaining agreement first negotiated in 1949. Since the union locals had assumed the chief responsibility for the referral of production workers to industry and since this, in fact, amounts to responsibility for the hiring of workers, the unions responsible became the chief targets of the anti-discrimination forces.

Did the union discriminate against Negroes, and was this by intent? How did this pattern of Negro exclusion come about? Was it a matter of ideology? Was it policy or coincidental to other matters? A look at union-management relations and conditions in the industry through World War II provides some explanation of these matters and helps to put in context the changes which occurred after that date.

The Creation of An "Ingroup"

Quite recently a Negro active in the fight against discrimination in the brewery industry claimed that the unions discriminate in favor of "Germans, Irish, Italians, and Jews in that order." And indeed the largely German ownership of the breweries is what commends itself first to many people as the plausible explanation for the traditional exclusion of Negroes from the industry. The argument runs that the early brewers were Germans or persons of German extraction, many of whom had been brewmasters before coming to America; the general tendency was to surround themselves with their countrymen who had been previously employed in the industry. Jobs were then handed down from family to family and once the pattern was set -- including the exclusion of Negroes along with other non-Germans -- it was difficult to change. The Germans had a vested interest in their jobs.

Actually, the relationship between the German origins of the early brewers and their workmen and any pattern of Negro exclusion is a less direct and simple one. It has more to do with the union which the early German brewery workers created and the union-management relations which resulted.

Although there were breweries in New York as early as 1612 and though for over 200 years they supplied a light demand for English brews, including porter and heavy ale, it was only the immigration of large numbers of Germans to the United States, particularly in the 1860s, which increased the demand for alcoholic malt beverages and led to the establishment of breweries manufacturing lager beer. By the beginning of the twentieth century there were more than a hundred breweries in New York; but the total number of workers employed was small.

The characteristic relationship between the German brewery workers and their employers was hardly that of a helping hand extended by one countryman to another. Before the 1880s working conditions were barely tolerable. In the 1860s a normal working schedule was 14 to 18 hours per day plus 6 to 8 hours on Sunday. Wages were about $20 to $25 per month. Employees were often boarded and lodged by the employers, sometimes in the foremen's homes or in boarding houses which bought beer from the brewer. Payment for board, under such terms, was in the neighborhood of $5 a week -- pretty much all the worker's pay.

Small wonder that these workers, many of whom had come from a fairly radical tradition in Germany, began to organize to better their working conditions. The earliest brewery strike in New York City was recorded in 1872. Without attempting any complete history of unionization, we record some facts pertinent to our study.

The brewery workers early recognized their points of vulnerability. First, most of the jobs in a brewery were then, just as they are today, not highly skilled jobs. Second, the production workers (the brewers) were few in number and, moreover, during the long working hours they were scattered and out of touch with each other. The average number of men employed in a brewery in 1870 was 6; in 1880 it had risen to 12; and by 1905 this average had increased to 31. As we know, unskilled workers are readily replaced, especially when they are few in number and dispersed among many places of employment. During a New York strike in 1881 the beer-wagon drivers, who were not organized, took the place of the strikers and under the guidance of the brewmasters and foremen performed the work of the brewerymen. If the brewery workers wanted to better their own working conditions and, through union, to gain a certain amount of control over their own destiny in the industry, a strike was obviously not an effective bargaining weapon.

Their first answer was to substitute the economic boycott for the strike. The brewery workers' use of this tactic may seem somewhat ironic in the light of subsequent events. For it was economic boycott and economic pressure which Negro organizations used many years later in order to challenge the effects of that union control. At least on a community-wide basis, the boycott had some success when other union men joined in. "We could do it," a brewery union member once recalled, "because beer isn't like soap or cloth or something where the women do the buying. Men are better organized than women. And anyway -- well, you know how it is yourself. Men stick together better than women do. Men make beer and buy beer. And a whole lot of men have gone thirsty sooner than buy 'unfair' beer."[7]

The second answer to their organizing needs was an industrial union; in other words, the distribution workers, the brewery wagon drivers, had to be brought into the same union with the "inside" brewers. The production workers had found themselves too small a group to withstand the pressure of the organized employers, especially when other employees, sometimes in the same brewery, could be put in their places. Brewing became one of the few industries in America organized along industrial lines before the 1930s.

The unionization of New York brewery workers was actually completed by 1885, and on April 16, 1886, they closed a contract with the brewery owners for a period of one year. The National Union of Brewery Workers of the United States (later known as the international Union of United Brewery Workmen of America, and still later, as the International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, and Soft Drink Workers of America) was created in the same year.

---

[7] Beulah Amiden, "Men Who Make the Beer," Survey Graphic, Vol. 22, May 1933, p. 256.

This union, which affiliated with the American Federation of Labor in 1887, preached not only unionism but the socialist political creed. The official union paper, Brauer Zeitung, was edited by Hermann Schlueter, a well-known socialist. Its first declaration of principles was a militantly class-conscious document and so was its first "official history" written in 1910.[8] Nevertheless, most of the time union activities were dictated not by the general "good of the working class, " but by the day-to-day interest of its members. For instance, Brewery Union 1 in New York was organized first as a local assembly of the Knights of Labor, and other locals followed suit. Yet the affiliation of the national union with the American Federation of Labor and its disaffiliation with the Knights of Labor was to a large extent a matter of disagreement with the early prohibition stand of the General Master Workman of the latter order.

Organization paid off. Some years later the secretary of the International Union wrote that when one compared the conditions of brewery workmen at the beginning of 1888 with conditions one or two years previously, "it can truthfully be said that hardly ever has such a tremendous change taken place in the history of any trade in so short a time."[9] Statistics for New York, by way of example, show that before organization wages were about $40 to $60 per month and that after organization they had gone up to about $65 to somewhat over $75 per month. At the same time workers who, before organization, had labored for some 14 to 18 hours on weekdays, had had their daily hours reduced to 10. And where they had been working several hours on Sunday, organization meant that they might work two hours at double pay.

Of course, unionization did not proceed without struggle. Beginning in 1888 the brewery owners declared a general lockout in all the principal cities of the country and the strife which followed lasted for years and in some places for a decade. Opposition to their union seems only to have reinforced solidarity among the brewery workers. What emerged from all this in the years before the end of World War I and the drought of the national prohibition years was a compact, militant union organization which was very much aware of its inherent weaknesses and the need to organize in such a way as to strengthen its bargaining power.[10]

---

[8] Hermann Schlueter, The Brewing Industry and The Brewery Workers' Movement in America, Cincinnati: The International Union of United Brewery Workmen of America, 1910.

[9] Joseph Obergfell, American Federationist, Vol. 38, July-Dec. 1931, p. 1240.

It would seem, then, that if the national background of the early brewers and brewery workmen was of any lasting consequence, this was due in the main to the strong union tradition and strong bargaining position it left to a group of workers who, in terms of skill-monopoly, were potentially weak. As a result the brewery workers, while hardly of the "aristocracy of labor," commanded the best of wages. But the inheritance left by the core of German workingmen who founded the union was not an organization based on an ethnic exclusiveness. The actual monopoly of jobs by Germans began to disappear at an early point in the history of the American industry. Workers of other nationalities, not as politically radical as the Germans, had begun to come into the industry in considerable numbers during the early period of unionization. What this German core did was to convert what might have remained an occupationally depressed and disparate group into a closely knit organization of well-paid workers. The cohesiveness of this ingroup can alone explain the way in which the union managed to flourish and keep its control over hiring and working conditions in the face of the crises with which it was confronted in the next fifteen years.

Protecting the Status Quo: Prohibition, Depression, and Repeal

It was not until World War I that Negroes first came to constitute a recognized and sizeable portion of the New York labor force. During that period and the prosperous years of the twenties Negroes made their entry into certain industries. The Brewery Workers, like other unions, had been organized in a "white era" when Negroes in large numbers hardly ever competed for the same jobs as whites. But Negroes did not find their way into the union during the years of relative fluidity which followed the war, mostly because the brewery workers were busily holding on to what they had, and there was no room for newcomers.

---

[10] Other unions used boycott and industrial organization in those years, but did not achieve results comparable to those of the brewery workers.

The precarious position of the brewery workers can easily be surmised. Where before prohibition 10,000 men had been employed in the New York breweries, only about 2000 kept their jobs during the twenties and early thirties. To be sure, a number of enterprising breweries did manage to keep going despite the Volstead Act. They manufactured ice cream, ice, cereal beverages. A few also made corn syrup, malt food tonic, glucose, ginger ale, baker's yeast, and so forth. Nevertheless, of 1100 pre-prohibition breweries in the United States, only 177 managed to survive the dry decade.

At first prohibition and then the depression cut into production, brewery management as well as the brewery unions waged a joint battle to "spread the work." Continued during the depression was a tried and tested union rule according to which the brewery owners agreed not to discharge union members at the end of the busy season but to pass around whatever work was available. Plant repairs and replacements were made during the dull season, wherever possible, by brewery workers. It was Ruppert, who once had waged a bitter battle against unionization, who in 1931 is reported to have said that there wasn't enough work for the several hundred men he employed, but "you can't fire an old hand."[11]

The basic principles of the hiring system, which figured prominently in the charges of discrimination in the 1950s, were thus of long standing and survived prohibition and depression. For example, a labor agreement reported in the Monthly Labor Review of 1925 between a brewing company in Wilkes-Barre and the Brewery Workers Union shows that the union agreed to furnish or supply union men capable and experienced in the work and that only where there were no union men available might the company hire nonunion employees. As today, all production workers came to the jobs through the union.

The fact that the union survived the prohibition era and retained its control over hiring left it in a strong position when legal beer came back shortly after Roosevelt took office in 1933.

The second opportunity for Negroes to break the color line came with repeal in 1933. Two facts stand out. First, in the chaotic days which followed immediately after legalization, the employment situation was fluid:

---

[11] Information on breweries during prohibition can be found in Gerald Holland, "Outlawed Industry Comes Back," Scientific American, Vol. 141, Nov. 1929, pp. 428-30; also in "Beer Barons of New York," American Mercury, Vol. 23, Aug. 1930, pp. 401-7 from where the quote on Ruppert is cited.

There were jobs. Second, even though it is possible that here and there a Negro may have found casual work in those early days, we do know that no Negro secured any sort of a permanent or seasonal permanent job as a result.

Summarizing what he found at this time, the director of industrial relations of the National Urban League wrote: "Unless labor unions will permit, Negroes will have little chance of engaging in the manufacture of beer."[12] A letter from the general secretary-treasurer of the International Union was said to give "little hope that unions will consider Negro workers." In a few cities some Negroes were reported to be driving wagons; in one or two other cities "some" were engaged in the manufacturing processes. Exclusionist policies toward Negroes continued after beer was re-legalized.

A reporter surveying the situation at a Brooklyn local during the first days of repeal quoted a union official as stating, "...we can surely use all the men and all the equipment we can get hold of right now." Three days after legal beer went on sale, the sidewalk, the halls, the secretary's office were thronged with workers. Calls went out to round up old union men somehow lost track of during the twenties. "We got so much work all of a sudden there ain't the men to do it."[13]

The natural question is this: If "there ain't the men to do it," why didn't Negroes find their way into the industry and into the union during that period? To what extent was this a case of deliberate discrimination against a minority group?

In arriving at any answer certain background factors must be taken into account. Most important, this was the period of a severe and generalized economic depression: The pre-repeal prognostications concerning production and the number of men who would be permanently employed in the beer industry proved over-optimistic; conditions simmered down considerably after the first rush. On top of this, tastes had altered during the years of prohibition; per capita beer consumption never again reached the pre-World War I rates. Moreover, certain technical advances made during the years of prohibition when brewery engineers kept up their activities (especially in refrigeration) meant that fewer workers and possibly fewer brewing plants were needed to produce and distribute a given quantity of malt beverages. Thus while 712 breweries were in operation in the country in 1934, only 460 were still going in 1945. A great many of these casualties occurred in the first few years after repeal.

---

[12] Kerns, op. cit., p. 15.

[13] Amiden, op. cit.

For all these reasons there were fewer permanent or seasonal permanent jobs in the industry than expected. A large proportion of the New York jobs could therefore be filled by the 2000 men still on the job, by old hands who were induced to return (sometimes after a deliberate search had been made for them), and by kinsmen of the old hands who had "come of age" during the years of drought, not draught. Notwithstanding the "panic" reported in the Brooklyn local during the first hectic days after repeal, the jobs which remained open to competition were eagerly sought. In those days any job -- let alone a good one -- was hard to come by. One suspects that a good many jobs went to unemployed holding cards in other unions.

Union racial policies are influenced by the condition of the labor market. The proposition that in times of labor shortages union policies are likely to be more equalitarian than in times of labor surpluses seems fairly well established.[14] This was 1933 and union racial policies were less likely to be equalitarian.

Not only economic conditions but the prevailing discriminatory practices of craft unions must be noted. The Brewery Workers, as we have noticed, had given "employment in the brewing industry" the psychological character of a craft, and members of this industrial union actually came to share the "work scarcity consciousness" of the craft unionist. Having no real monopoly on skill, they did have a monopoly on admission to employment and -- even in an hour when work was comparatively abundant -- they felt the need to ensure the continuance of their monopoly. This meant ensuring that they could "control" entry and that newcomers were of their own kind. To many craft unionists Negroes were, in 1933, strangers and potential strikebreakers, and thus race prejudice entered.

Fundamentally what happened in 1933 was this: The union, faced with a flood of new workers in a period of general labor surplus, fought to protect its control over the craft which was not only its own creation but essential to its survival. As several interviewees pointed out, "the Negroes just weren't as well organized then as they are now." They could not bring effective pressures to bear on the union or the management. They had no governmental agency to which to turn for redress of alleged discrimination. They lacked power; they lacked know-how.

---

[14] See Ruchames, op. cit., pp. 193-196.

To summarize, then, the exclusion of Negroes from production and distribution jobs in the brewing industry through the 1930s can be related to a number of developments:
(1) the creation within the industry of a strong and inbred union;
(2) which sought in the face of its own inherently weak bargaining position and adverse industrial conditions;
(3) by use of a powerful weapon, namely, its virtual control over hiring;
(4) to give priority to the interests of its own members with regard to available work and the maintenance of high wage rates.

All this was in the absence of:
(5) any noticeable efforts on the part of industry to force the hiring of Negro workers;
(6) or any vociferous demands on the part of the Negro community and Negro workers for jobs in the New York breweries;
(7) or any effective pressures from organized groups among the Negroes;
(8) or any governmental machinery to handle charges of discrimination on the basis of color brought by injured parties.

II. CHANGING CONDITIONS AND PRESSURES EXERTED

After 1933, but especially after World War II, all these forces which had been effecting the exclusion of Negroes from the production phases of the brewing industry were more or less altered. The breakdown in the pattern of non-integration can be traced to the convergence of such changes. The changes and their ramifications are detailed in the sections which follow.

Changing Conditions in the Industry

1. A shrinking industry. In the 1920s when most industries were booming, breweries by diverse means had somehow held on and remained in production, all in the expectation that prohibition could not last forever. But when consumer expenditures reached new all-time highs after World War II, beer consumption nevertheless went down. A business magazine summed up the situation in March 1955: "The $2.5 billion U.S. brewing industry is going down, while everything else in the U.S. economy is going up." [15]

---

[15] Business Week, March 12, 1955, p. 152.

Technological innovation was also having its effect. Exactly how much unemployment is traceable to change in technology has not been determined; the conclusion that fewer men could produce the smaller amounts of beer being consumed is inevitable. In the five-year period from 1949 to 1954 six of the eleven leading breweries in New York City either shut down or sold out.

2. Security and the status quo. The threat of underemployment and unemployment spurred unionists to renewed efforts to protect what they had won in the past. In the troubled times they moved to tighten their lines according to true craft union psychology. The chief aim of the "ins" was to formalize their seniority rights so that they could not be touched. A number of wildcat strikes erupted in 1949 and 1950 when breweries sought to lay off employees at a time of slack.

The unionists' concern with security created somewhat of a dilemma for the employers in the brewing industry. On the one hand, the brewers, being economically vulnerable, were anxious to stay on good terms with the brewery unions. There was sharp competition for local markets, and prolonged strikes could force shut-downs. Indeed the sale of at least one plant in the New York area was believed to have been necessitated by losses incurred in a strike. On the other hand, declining consumption led the brewers to resist granting seniority to "too many" workers; management balked at the idea of keeping on more men than were needed to do the work. It was out of union-management negotiation, conducted against this background, that the first seniority clause written into a collective bargaining agreement between the Brewery Workers Joint Board of New York and the brewing companies emerged (effective June 1, 1949).

Actually, both sides seem to have gotten what they wanted and felt they needed. The union wanted to protect the seniority rights of the men who were "in," and to safeguard their working conditions; management was interested in limiting the number of men toward whom they had a responsibility. The agreement intended first and foremost to protect the status quo by guarding against infiltration of the ranks.

We may look at the seniority clause of their agreement. Section 10 (F) of the collective bargaining agreement categorized employees in each department of a brewery into three groups. Group I and most of Group II consisted of more or less full-time employees. Group III were "casuals" working in the industry mostly during the busy season. Without detailing the various exceptions and elaborations the three groups may be characterized as follows:

Group I included all those who, as of the beginning of 1949, had had four years of continuous employment in the industry with continuous service under their present employer for a given period (generally from 30 days to

6 months, according to the department in which they worked). All apprentices in the brewing department were also considered Group I.

Group II consisted of all employees who, at the time of the agreement, did not meet the qualifications for inclusion under Group I but who had acquired some seniority with their present employer.

The remainder, Group III, consisted of all employees who had not acquired the seniority necessary for Group II status.

Talking about this seniority clause a few years later a management representative recalled that it "was negotiated in the heat of a strike, without any background of experience, either in the industry or in the unions, of seniority arrangements." And according to him it was only to avoid further trouble that the brewers gave the union representatives pretty much what they had asked for. "We took the position for the industry that you fellows want a seniority clause, tell us what you want, it's your business."

So far as the discrimination-against-minorities charge is concerned, the key provisions of this classification system had to do with the acquisition of seniority with an employer and with the transition from Group III to Group II status.

Section 10 (B) read in part: "An employee shall acquire seniority with the Employer after completion of 165 days of employment with such Employer not interrupted by layoff of more than six (6) consecutive months." This 165-day/six-month rule, as it generally came to be known, was intended by both union and management to limit the number of people who might attain rights of recall and to safeguard union members against layoffs. The clause was particularly restrictive since it further provided that all of these 165 days had to be accumulated in the *same* department of *one* brewery. (We shall see how difficult that might be.) This provision was renewed without change when the 1949 contract expired two years later. But even before the collective bargaining agreement was to come up for renegotiation for the second time in June 1952, the qualifications for Group II status were considerably stiffened. In February of that year the rule became 250 days/one month. From now on in order to make Group II status, Group III workers (the casuals) were required to work 250 days in one department of one brewery without a break of more than 30 days.

This clause is even more restrictive in operation than may appear from the letter. The obstacle lies not so much in the accumulation of 250 days of work in one department of one brewery as it does in the "30-day break." To illustrate: There are, at the outside, six busy months a year. The brewing season runs from April 15 at the earliest to October 15 at the latest. During good times if John Doe is lucky enough to be hired in a department which carries him during the full busy season, he may rather easily accumulate 130 days or so of work toward Group II status. The accumulation of employment on enough days to fulfill his quota would be no special problem if it were not for the slow season when work is scarce. The next busy season will easily give him another 130 days of steady work. The rub lies in "bridging the slow season." John Doe may be employed one day in each of the slow months of November, December, January, and February. But if he fails to work from February 15 to April 1 he hasn't bridged the gap -- the break would be for more than 30 days -- and he would have to start accumulating time toward status all over again. His time has been "wiped out."

Both union and management representatives claim that the change in the clause to make it more restrictive was merely a response to economic realities. They disclaim any intention to discriminate. According to the union, "welfare was the big problem at the time." Management recalled: "They [the union] wanted improvements in welfare [i.e., welfare and pension funds] and we were not willing to improve them for every person who came to work."[16] Group III employees, in most cases, were not eligible for such funds.

But Negro workers and representatives of interested Negro organizations charged that the 250-day/one month provision was expressly designed to keep Negroes out of the industry. Just about the time the change in the clause became effective a number of Negroes were beginning to register and to report for referrals by the unions to the breweries. The clause did, in fact, operate to freeze the work situation. The status quo was to be fostered and that status quo, as we have seen, had in the past virtually excluded Negro production and distribution workers from the brewery industry. The union-management collective bargaining agreement formalized this exclusion.

Was there intent on the part of the union to exclude Negroes by making it more difficult to attain Group II status? Had the management anything to gain by excluding Negroes? It would seem that in terms both of understanding this case and of gaining clues from it as to future policy, the motives of individuals are less important than the economic interests of the groups involved. There is no evidence that personal antipathy against Negro workers on the part of the union leaders or the rank-and-file entered into the re-negotiation of the clause. This does not mean that individuals were not prejudiced or that the presence in some numbers of Negroes at the shape-up (for referral) did not heighten personal and collective insecurity. But the agreement was, above all, a response on the part of both union and management to the change in the industrial situation. Its discriminatory effects are another matter.

---

[16] One brewery representative pointed out that Group III workers were eligible for its pension plan if they wished to contribute, but few took advantage of this.

3. A new accent on advertising. Brewers have been public-relations conscious for a long time. Being social leaders of their German-American communities at the time of World War I, they were associated in the public mind with the enemy and became a prime target of sentiment directed against the "Hun." Also, they were very much aware of another almost fatal mistake they had made in the pre-Prohibition era: their dependence on "tied houses" and financial deals to guarantee a steady market. These tied houses were saloons in which the brewers owned some interest or for which they supplied fixtures and furnishings free. In view of this tie-in, the brewers had done little to appease the ill-will of the wives whose men mugged down the beer in those saloons. D. W. Brogan, tying up women's suffrage and the Anti-Saloon League, claims that the nineteenth amendment came just too late to save the old-fashioned saloon.[17]

After repeal the brewers' trade associations launched a public-relations campaign to protect their industry from any adverse publicity and to dissociate it, once and for all, from the bad name of the old-time saloon. But advertising became also a more direct means to an end. Brewers, who had relied on the saloons to ensure a demand for their product, now vied with one another through mass appeals and through carefully placed advertising for their share of the potential market.

Thus brewery management had paid the price of adverse publicity in the past. Concerned over the decline in beer consumption, and increasingly dependent on advertising to promote sales, they were therefore particularly alert to changes in the market and to outside pressures. At the same time the New York brewers had discovered the Negro market and were now actively cultivating it. This can be seen from the fact that breweries were in the 1940s among the heaviest advertisers in Negro weeklies and magazines. Special ads often stressed the preference of Negro celebrities for a particular beer. Special promotion and sales campaigns were directed toward potential Negro customers and Negroes themselves were engaged in that effort.

As already indicated, some leading brewers employed Negroes prior to 1950 as promotion and sales representatives to drum up trade in

---

[17] D. W. Brogan, The American Problem, London: Hamish Hamilton, 1944, p. 60.

Negro areas. Two of the big shipping brewers were among the first to use Negro sales representatives. It may be noted that the large shippers, even more than the brewers for the local market, were dependent on advertising to create new and expand old markets for their product. Two local breweries, Liebmann (Rheingold) and Schaefer, by 1950 were employing Negro sales and promotional representatives. A number of Negro "good-will ambassadors" were used also by breweries for special promotional efforts. According to an Urban League survey, "most of the employers of Negro sales representatives stated that their Negro employees have done a tremendous job in raising the sales of their product." But "the practice of employing 'hand shakers' or 'glamour boys' as they are referred to in some Negro circles," we are cautioned, "has not always proved successful, nor has the practice met with the approval of some Negro business men who purchase brewery products. One brewery branch manager voiced the opinion that men who do a routine day-to-day job of selling are more effective in the long run than the big name."[18]

In developing the Negro market, the brewers gained customers. This very gain also made them vulnerable to any pressures which threatened to affect their share of sales in that market.

The Realization of Negro Power

1. The Negro market. As the brewery executives became aware of the Negro market, the Negroes themselves also became aware of it and of the bargaining power which it might put in their hands. For the Negro population of the New York area had increased considerably with each passing decade, and their average income was steadily increasing. In 1933 conditions in Harlem and other Negro pockets of the New York area had been, to say the least, depressed.[19] Many families were on relief, unemployed, or what was euphemistically called "temporarily laid off without pay." At that time, when breweries were once again hiring and Negroes were probing the job market, the Negro market must have seemed hardly worth cultivating even for nickel beer.

But after repeal consumers did not drink nearly as much beer as had been anticipated. Nor did old habits return with better times in the 1940s. Therefore the Negro market became a much more attractive proposition. Negroes were, indeed, to become good customers for the brewers. In 1952 half the Negro families in New York City bought bottled beer and two-fifths bought canned beer.[20] This constitutes a sizeable market by any criterion.

---

[18] Kerns, op. cit., p. 33

[19] See "Complete Report of the Mayor's Commission on Conditions in Harlem," published in the New York Amsterdam News, July 18, 1936.

2. Sales into jobs. To translate the buying power of the Negro community into jobs for individual Negroes was the goal a number of groups in the Negro community now set for themselves. After 1933 Negroes had become more conscious of the political power they might wield. Politically their strength lay in the demonstration of the ability of Negro politicians to "deliver the vote" as a political bloc.[21] But the development of economic power through the manipulation of consumer purchases was more complicated. The decision to buy one beer rather than another, however, is, strangely enough, a more personal thing than the decision to vote. Who, like the precinct captain, is to "deliver the purchases"?

During the 1940s and even before that, Negro newspapers throughout the country, in cooperation with various organizations in the Negro communities, had sponsored the "Buy Where You Work Movement."[22] This boycott of the products manufactured and sold by plants and firms from which the Negro had been excluded was an attempt to open more employment to Negro workers. Meanwhile Negro publicists and Negro pressure groups reinforced their campaign by bringing the facts of the Negro market to the attention of industrialists. The Kerns study put out in 1951 by the National Urban League was part of the publicity designed to call attention to the schism between the facts of Negro employment and the facts of the Negro market. Moreover, its author saw the market as more decisive in changing attitudes than any ideology. Any change in attitude toward the employment of Negroes in the brewing industry, said the report, was "reflective of interest in the Negro market even more than of the national trend toward elimination of racial discrimination in employment."[23]

---

[20] According to a commercial survey undertaken in 1952.

[21] Negroes, especially in northern cities like Chicago and New York, were of course conscious of their potential political power long before 1933. One of the classic and enduring studies of Negro ward politics in these years is Harold Gosnell's Negro Politicians. The Rise of Negro Politics in Chicago, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1935.

[22] The first "Buy Where You Work" movement, The Whip, began in Chicago in 1931 and was short lived. The most important organization in this field, The New Negro Alliance, started in Washington, D. C., in 1933. It was copied by organizations in New York,Cincinnati, Baltimore, Boston, etc., and the whole movement was held up until the Washington group won the right of consumer racial picketing in the United States Supreme Court in 1938. The first such organization in Harlem was the Joint Committee on Harlem, sponsored by Reverends Adam Clayton Powell and William Lloyd Imes.

3. Economic pressure groups. The history of the pressures to effect changes in the hiring policies of the breweries brought by various organizations in the Negro community is a vivid if sometimes confusing one. In the early 1950s efforts to secure jobs for Negroes in the production and distributive phases of the industry were stepped up, and a great deal of interest appears to have centered on them. Interest was further aroused when a certain amount of animosity developed among the several Negro organizations who were trying to do something about the brewery situation. This animosity reflected, in part, a more general division of outlook in the Negro community and, in part, a difference in opinion concerning the specific tactics to be applied in the effort.

In New York two Negro organizations more than others played a public role in the fight against discrimination in the brewery industry: the United African Nationalist Movement and the Urban League of Greater New York.[24] The UANM was the chief advocate of direct economic pressure through boycott; the Urban League relied on public relations and negotiations, emphasizing especially the quid pro quo: a share in production in return for a share in the market.

Both these groups played an important part in the legal action which developed. A recitation of the part they played in the brewery case during the early 1950s will help us to arrive at an evaluation of their tactics.

The United African Nationalist Movement. During 1951 the UANM undertook a boycott of Rheingold beer and that boycott was in effect until some time in the spring of 1952. At some time or other every retail store in Harlem and the Bronx -- including bars and grills selling Rheingold beer, a Liebmann product -- had a picket line thrown around it. The motives for the boycott were somewhat devious. The boycott was directed at Liebmann's not because the UANM considered this company most guilty of discriminatory practices. The reason a UANM leader gave for singling out Liebmann's was that its beer was the most popular brand in the Negro community and therefore the company was most vulnerable to Negro boycott. If the Negroes in New York City were to stop drinking Rheingold, reasoned the UANM leaders, this could put as many as 350 men out of work. Therefore it seemed perfectly fair to expect Rheingold to give jobs to at least 350 Negro production and distribution workers. Apparently the UANM did make just such a proposal to Liebmann's in November 1951, either prior to or after the establishment of the picket lines.

---

[23] Kerns, *op. cit.*, p. 1.

[24] Among the other organizations were some reportedly spearheaded by Communist front groups, among them The Harlem Trade Council. See Kerns, *op. cit.*, p. 43.

But in embarking on the boycott the UANM had still another goal in mind. The Harlem boycott might secure a distributorship for some Negroes, positions they had already won in other cities such as Cleveland, Detroit, Chicago, and Philadelphia. In these cities authorized Negro distributors of brewery products were operating under contract and handled delivery of various beers, though principally in Negro areas and for dealers serving the Negro market.

How successful was the picketing? Even had they felt it proper or reasonable, Liebmann's was obviously in no position to meet a demand for such a quota of Negro workers. Applicants for production and distribution jobs in the breweries had to be referred by the union under the collective bargaining agreement; the companies were free to hire from the open market only when the union had no men for referral. For the quota proposal to be workable, it was necessary for 350 Negroes to be both registered with the unions and reporting each day for referral as they were required to do. Probably nowhere near as many were doing so at the time; the reasons why they were not is something we shall discuss.

On the other hand, there is good evidence that, though surveys taken in the spring of 1952 showed that Rheingold was still the most popular of beers among Negroes, the economic effects of the boycott were felt by the company and within the Negro community itself. Officials of the company complained that their pocketbook as well as their pride had been hurt. Harlem beer retailers were seriously affected, and to offset the picketing, part of the Negro community set up the United Labor Management Committee. This committee consisted of representatives of the Associated Grocers of Harlem and Local 338, Retail Wholesale and Chain Store Food Employees Union. Though pledged to do whatever they could to promote jobs for Negroes in the brewery industry, these organizations wished to avoid further losses by first trying other types of pressure on management. But unless the industry came through with some concrete action by the summer of 1952 at the latest, the head of the union warned at a public meeting, it would institute its own boycott on beer, with tavern owners, bartenders, and grocery clerks committed to join them in not handling the beer of breweries which were still discriminatory after that time.

Around the beginning of 1952 the UANM opened a new phase in its campaign. Utilizing, it appears, its own leadership cadre for this purpose, it laid plans to have Negroes register for work with the Brewery Union locals and to shape (report) for referral to the breweries. These experiences resulted in the filing of seven complaints with the New York State Commission Against Discrimination. Four of these complaints were against union locals and three against brewing companies. The substance of the charges was that the union-respondent had refused to allow the complainants to register or permitted them to register but refused to refer them for employment.

The following were typical of the complaints. One complainant charged that time and time again he had gone to the office of a local handling employees in brewing departments to register for work. He had been told by officials of this union which, incidentally, had no shape-up that, this being the slow season, with brewing departments taking on few casual workers, they had no work and were therefore not accepting any registrations. Ultimately he was allowed to register. To this charge the union retorted that they, indeed, had not been registering new applicants but had, on the complainant's insistence, made an exception.

Another complainant held that he had been allowed to register with a local. However, he was not informed that, in order to secure employment, he would have to shape on the days when he wanted work. The union claimed that this information had been made available to him and that no one had tried to mislead the respondent about the need to shape. They also claimed that they had referred him for work when he did shape despite his poor record as a worker.

Still a third stated that he had not been referred to jobs in his turn and that he was being discriminated against on the basis of color. Union officials replied that even while regular union men had been unemployed, they had gone out of their way to refer the complainant. Moreover, the job of "brewer" to which they had referred him would have given him an opportunity to advance to Group II status (and union membership). The complainant admitted that this was so and that he now felt he had made a mistake in not accepting the offer but at the time he had been working steady on the outside and did not want to work "indoors."

These and other complaints were disposed of by SCAD in January 1953. The charges, as can be seen, had to do with direct discrimination in registration and referral and more indirect discrimination through misinformation. But specific discriminatory practices are sometimes difficult to pinpoint when what workers are really up against is a pattern of exclusion established as part of a hiring system, and some specific allegations were indeed found to be without merit. Therefore the Commission addressed itself to the underlying problem, the referral system, which obscured the stratagems by which Negroes could continue to be excluded from the industry. Under the terms of conciliation the unions were required to commit themselves to make referrals for employment without regard to race, creed, color, or national origin. They were also to provide specific written information to all persons registering for employment as to union procedures with regard to referral, including the need, if any, for shaping, the time and place of the shape-up, and the various union classifications. In its public statement concerning the cases SCAD noted that referral practices had changed during the period of investigation and that Negroes, including some of the complainants whose cases were being heard, had been referred and employed by the time the cases were up for adjudication.

But the most significant effect of this first group of complaints brought by UANM members was that, for the first time, the force of an outside authority came into the brewery case. Both union and management were on notice that complete self-regulation was at an end. Whatever the intent of their agreements on hiring, SCAD would prevent the exploitation of clauses in order to discriminate against persons on the basis of race, creed, color, or national origin. SCAD could not force the industry to open jobs to Negroes, but it could see that their efforts to gain entry were not encumbered by specific discriminatory practices or by a referral system which invited all sorts of devious practices.

The publicity given the cases had a salutary effect. For one thing it allowed a public airing and examination of complaints against the industry which had been circulating for some time. Indeed Liebmann's, which could have gotten out of the charge on a legal technicality, waived its privilege since it wished to have the opportunity to answer the charges openly. Its management felt also that any effort on its part to interfere with a full hearing of the complaints might be interpreted as a sign of guilt. Actually, so vulnerable to adverse publicity in the Negro community did they feel themselves that officials of Liebmann's even considered the placement of advertisements in the Negro press proclaiming their policy of non-discriminatory hiring. A much better policy, according to expert public relations advice which they took, was to counter the charges through "propaganda of the deed," by speeding the hiring of colored help. Nor does this exclude the fact that a number of high-ranking Liebmann officials had personal beliefs strongly opposed to all discrimination and were therefore concerned about how the charges might reflect on their own integrity.[25]

---

[25] One Liebmann official, for instance, had during the war served in a government position where he exerted his efforts in behalf of integration. At least one other expressed sincere anti-discrimination sentiments to the writer.

Publicity served yet another purpose. If in 1953 Negroes began to shape the halls in greater numbers, this can be attributed in part to what had happened in 1952. Negroes would not keep shaping the halls unless they saw a prospect of obtaining work. As one UANM official pointed out, whenever a few get work, word spreads around quickly and results in an increase in the number of applications. For example, when one of the complainants was referred to and hired by a brewery, people in his apartment house who heard about it spread the word; when another got a job delivering beer, the Negroes in a bar where he made a delivery reportedly came out to help him roll in the kegs, because "they were so impressed with the fact of seeing a Negro delivery man."

The tactics employed by the UANM did get results, even if these fell short of what the UANM had aimed for. But, in addition, these tactics reveal something of the philosophy of the UANM. The organization has put on record its belief that only militant, ceaseless, and spectacular methods would achieve results. The drive was one to secure jobs for Negroes whatever the means necessary; no other interest could be considered. Its spokesman, James Lawson, saw it as imperative that when colored persons sought affirmative steps in their own interest it should be without regard to the possible effect on the rights of men working. In his opinion, indeed, the claim for a job of any man unemployed superseded the seniority rights of others. Moreover, in seeking jobs for Negroes in the brewery industry, the UANM often would seem to have directed as much of its fire against the Urban League as against the employees, the union, and any retailer or employee or consumer demanding consideration. In an item about a public conference convened by the Urban League, the Amsterdam News (Mav 7, 1952) reported that it had "turned into a name-calling contest when a group of disgruntled men charged the organization's officials with 'Uncle Tom-ism' and 'pussy-footing'" when it came to pressing for the integration of Negroes into the brewing industry. At one point an unidentified speaker (one of about a dozen representing the UANM) charged the League's officials with being "in the pay of the white folks" and "in this thing just for philanthropy." According to the news report the League was accused of deliberately refusing to recognize the part that the UANM had played in breaking down lily-white barriers.

We can now examine what the Urban League had been doing to counter discrimination in the brewing industry and see in what way their tactics differed from those of the UANM.

The Urban League. Already in 1933 the Urban League, in conference and correspondence with management and labor, had explored the possibilities for integrating Negroes into the production and distributive phases of the brewing industry, and their efforts, for reasons already noted, had come to naught. But after World War II they revived their efforts to seek employment opportunities for Negro workers along with other groups in the Negro community. Discussions with some brewery officials led leaders of the Urban League to infer a "wholesome interest" in this problem of employment policy. Moreover, officers of the Brewery Workers International Union indicated that they would welcome any suggestions on how to implement the union's non-discriminatory policy through dealings with its locals. In response the Urban League decided first to seek the "facts" which could both be put before the interested parties and serve as a means of arousing public opinion.[26]

In October 1951, just about the time the UANM was instituting its economic boycott, the National Urban League and the Urban League of Greater New York extended an invitation to the Brewery Workers Joint Board, the union's representative body, requesting a meeting to discuss the problem of integration. This initiated a long period of conferences and negotiations, first with the union officials, and later with union and management together. By January 1952 meetings between the Joint Board of the union and the Urban League representatives had led to the formation of two committees: a union committee and a citizens' committee, both of which were to work toward the elimination of the "facts" of discrimination the League had uncovered.

Urban League officials, who were the citizens' committee's guiding force, soon found themselves under increasing pressure from the Negro press to do something about the situation. Monthly meetings of the citizens' committee were held throughout the first half of 1952, but there was nothing concrete to show for their efforts. These were the same months during which the UANM had filed its complaints with SCAD and was picketing in Harlem. The League was concentrating attention on getting men down to shape the halls, but little that could be dramatized had occurred -- hence the charges at the public meeting that the League was "pussy-footing." At that meeting, however, the League did not merely accept criticism; it explained its efforts. It publicized the need for men to shape during the busy season. It would do no good, the League held, to press for jobs as long as men did not appear to want them. The meeting also included a public appearance by a worker who testified that he had been shaping for referral and had been employed at irregular intervals in the preceding three weeks. The audience was thus urged to spread the word that jobs could be had at the halls of unions handling jobs in the bottling and bottle-delivery departments. Those present were given the addresses. Because of the financial risk which men willing to serve as guinea pigs would have to take, applicants were urged to find other jobs -- part-time jobs, night jobs, and so forth -- which would allow them to support their families while shaping the halls.

---

[26] The product was the Kerns monograph, already mentioned, published in 1951.

At a joint meeting with representatives of both labor and management in July 1952 the citizens' committee first presented a plan by which the industry would agree to absorb during the 1953 busy season a given number -- a "quota," to be exact -- of Negro employees. Agreement on such a plan was reached a few months later in October 1952, and in January of the following year, at the time when SCAD was disposing of the first group of brewery complaints brought by UANM representatives, all the parties concerned were putting their heads together to work out plans for implementing the quota agreement during the busy season in the spring.

The Urban League released the agreement to the press on March 6, 1953. The clauses of the agreement, as released, called for:

1. the employment of at least 100 Negroes in seasonal permanent[27] jobs during the coming season;

2. the establishment of a 3-man grievance committee to deal with complaints regarding the implementation of the agreement;

3. provisions for the establishment of referral offices in Harlem and Brooklyn which would make it easier for Negroes to register.

Absorption of 100 Negroes was to be brought about by stipulating that the first 3 employees hired in each department of each brewery, barring only a few departments requiring special skill, would be Negroes. The three-man grievance committee was to be composed of representatives: one from the unions, one from the Brewers Board of Trade, and one to act for the earlier citizens' committee. The referral halls to be set up by the Urban League were to guarantee that Negroes would appear to claim any jobs to which they were entitled by the agreement. When requiring additional workers, the employers were to notify these new referral centers in advance, so that Negro applicants would be present for referral when the call for employees went out in the union hiring halls. Moreover, in order to get Negroes to the halls, employers were to call a representative of the Harlem Labor Management Committee.

---

[27] See page 198.

The agreement was submitted to SCAD for examination only after it had been released to the press.[28] SCAD issued its own views in a press release. Its position was in the main directed at the quota clause. It did not look with favor on any agreement subscribing, even where this might seem to advance minorities, to the concept of quota employment or one which specified that a person seeking work had to come through a particular organization such as the Urban League. Its reasons were both principled and practical. The concept of quota employment was not in harmony with the spirit or letter of the Law Against Discrimination,[29] nor would it, in the long run, best serve the interest of minorities suffering from discrimination. Had not experience shown that a minimum was apt to become a maximum? Supposing that at least 100 Negroes should be employed; 100 Negroes might be all ever to be employed in the industry. The ultimate goal of anti-discrimination requires that there shall be no discrimination either for or against a person on the basis of race, creed, color, or national origin. Each person shall have the right to be judged solely on the basis of his individual merits. What should be done to overcome past inequities depends on what other values and interests are involved.

Though the agreement was never consummated, this does not mean that during this period there were no gains. During 1953 altogether 119 Negroes were employed at some time in some kind of production or distributive work by the New York breweries.[30] Yet, as far as the attainment of seniority status was concerned, the agreement fell far short of its goal. Only 29 Negroes had accumulated 100 or more days toward Group I status by the fall of 1953, and no more than 10 of these actually went on to 250 days without a 30-day break and made Group II status that year. Even though it was concluded before the 1953 busy season, the quota agreement failed to result in the placement of anywhere near 100 Negroes in seasonal permanent jobs. For, had that many been so placed, the numbers accumulating 100 days or more would have been significantly higher.

---

[28] This means the agreement was not formally submitted to SCAD to check its legality. SCAD was certainly kept informed of its contents and an earlier version of the plan had been submitted to it.

[29] Approval by SCAD would have carried with it the inference clearly stated that the Commission would not entertain complaints if the terms of the agreement were kept, i.e., if three Negroes were hired on a given day; thus, if 4 Negroes applied and one was rejected because the quota had been filled, in the event he filed a complaint the Commission would not act upon it.

[30] The employment of these 119 Negroes cannot be credited entirely to the agreement or the efforts of the Urban League. During this period SCAD held frequent conferences with union officials and sent field representatives to observe shape-ups at the various locals.

The question of why the agreement was not fulfilled is quite different and much more difficult to answer. Objections to the agreement came from various corners. Both the UANM and the Harlem Labor Management Committee as well as SCAD and the union took some issue with the implications of the proposed establishment of special referral offices for Negroes. Management, too, was alarmed by SCAD's reaction. Consequently there is good reason to believe that the agreement was never carried out in the manner proposed, because of both the inherent impracticality of the plan and the various reservations with which the interested parties approached it.

It is not clear whether these referral offices were ever formally set up. At least one official of the Brewery Workers Joint Board had opposed the Jim Crow aspects of establishing a separate employment office in Harlem as contrary to good union practice, and both SCAD and the UANM were somewhat concerned about the possibility that Urban League applicants might receive preference in job placements.

For its part the Urban League knew that the agreement could be implemented only if Negroes reported for employment. Hence they needed some sort of check to see whether the persons they sent off to the shape-up actually put in an appearance at the union halls. In answer they devised a system which would enable the League to check its own success in getting men down to the halls. But the motives behind it could easily be misinterpreted, for such a system could also be a means of gaining favor for League applicants. What the League did was to issue a slip to each person sent down for referral; the union stamped the slip to indicate that the applicant had presented himself at the shape-up. The slip was then supposed to be returned by the applicant to the League. As a further check League representatives, encouraged by management, observed the shape-ups and thereby exerted pressure on the union officials who sent workers out on jobs. In view of these checks to see that the agreement was lived up to, it seems as if ultimate responsibility for the failure to integrate more Negroes during that season of 1953 lay in the dearth of potential Negro workers. Even in the absence of statistics on the number of Negroes shaping each day, it was generally inferred by those in touch with the situation that Negroes during 1953 failed to apply for jobs in the numbers hoped for.

Two facts in particular can be adduced in evidence that the agreement did not lead to the results expected. First, disbanding in April 1954 of the grievance committee set up as part of the agreement was caused by the resignation of the citizens' representative. The representative, a distinguished Negro judge, felt the committee was serving no useful purpose. According to other sources the committee had been dormant before because the union representative (a member of the Brewery Workers Joint Board) was said to have absented himself from meetings. Local 1345, which he represented, was responsible for well over half the job-placements during any season. Without this local's cooperation the wings of the committee were clipped from the start. Even though a second union representative, appointed when the first resigned, exhibited more interest in the functioning of the group than his predecessor, it was too late; the resignation of the Negro judge meant the committee's dissolution.

In the end the Urban League of Greater New York had to alter its approach; it turned for help to SCAD. In April 1954 the League directed a number of men to the agency,[31] and their complaints ultimately led to a formal hearing before SCAD.

In turning to SCAD, as in its prior activities, the League had in mind the need to keep their fight in the public eye. They wanted to halt the adverse publicity which resulted from these setbacks and inaction. As before, publicity was the key weapon in the League's offensive. Thus in 1953, after SCAD reacted negatively to the quota agreement, the League sought sympathy and exoneration from the Negro public. The battle was waged primarily through the Negro press where the League held the advantage. SCAD, it charged, was not really attacking the industry-wide pattern, and it was the industry-wide pattern which had to be broken. Representatives of the League, while admitting that quota agreements were a basically undesirable intergroup practice, saw the agreement as a practical matter, necessary to break the pattern of discrimination; in any case, they argued, it was only a temporary solution. The quarrel between the Urban League and SCAD, the Amsterdam News (May 2, 1953) charged editorially -- supporting its argument with a cartoon -- offered "loopholes to the brewery industry and unions to ignore the promise 'to utilize at least 100 Negroes in the brewery industry this season.' "

While the League went publicly on record against the approach of SCAD, its way of dissociating itself from the United African Nationalist Movement was to ignore that organization as much as possible. This dissociation can easily be understood inasmuch as the explicit tactics of the two organizations represented approaches of quite a different order to the fight against discrimination. But in one important respect their activities were not so much at variance as they would appear. If at first the UANM had sought entry into the industry at whatever cost and regardless of the effect on other groups in the community, the League too began by pursuing its specific aims, whatever their implications for policy in the long run. In the end both organizations had to resort to legal machinery.

---

[31] By the time it came to a hearing the complainants were no longer legally represented by the League, but were provided with a lawyer by the NAACP.

This must be understood: The partial success of the League in 1952 and 1953 -- the cracking of the unyielding barriers by concession from union and management -- bore little relation to the suitability of its tactics. What mattered most was that the League could pursue its case against discrimination in the brewery industry more vigorously and with more chance of success than twenty years earlier. For one thing, the League itself had become a more widely respected force, and in terms of discrimination industrial conditions in general had vastly improved. But above all the Negroes were in a better position to bargain, an advantage of which League representatives were not entirely unaware. They did not hesitate to make what use they could of a "reminder." In a statement accompanying its first proposal for a quota agreement (August 1952), the citizens' committee reminded union and management representatives that acceptance of its terms "would certainly calm the many clamorings and agitations in non-white communities in Greater New York City which, at this point, could certainly flare up into trouble of tremendous proportions."

The Urban League was thus able to speak to brewers and brewery workers in the name of a Negro community pressing for integration on many fronts. Above all, it could remind them of their dependence on the Negro market.

The Transmutation of a Union

Two other changes in the latter 1940s helped to break the pattern of exclusion in the breweries of New York. For the first time victims of discrimination could turn to an outside authority for redress. The Ives-Quinn law, enacted on March 12, 1945, had created the New York State Commission Against Discrimination. The second change concerned the union. The old ingroup, i.e., the old Brewery Workers Union, was absorbed and the new ingroup into which it was transmuted was to prove particularly vulnerable to certain outside pressures. While the Negro community could lead from ever greater strength, the bargaining position of the ingroup was steadily deteriorating.

1. A struggle for power. In Part I we spoke of the brewery workers' efforts to attain and then to preserve their favorable economic

position. Organization along industrial lines played an integral part in these efforts, and the union had to struggle through most of its existence to maintain its status as an industrial union.

It was in 1900 that the Brewery Workers Union first asked its parent organization, the American Federation of Labor, for the right to organize the beer-wagon drivers. The Federation refused to grant this right. But apparently as a concession to what the Brewery Workers already had, a section was written into the constitution of the Federation providing that no incoming unions could trespass on the rights of prior affiliated unions without the consent of the latter. The International Brotherhood of Teamsters, organized along craft lines, was admitted into the Federation soon after in 1909. Technically it would seem that the keg-wagon drivers were teamsters, not brewers. The issue was officially resolved when, in 1916, the two unions achieved a sort of peace. They made a contract by which the Teamsters got the right to organize drivers in the soft-drink industry while jurisdiction over beer-wagon drivers remained in the Brewery Workers Union. Nevertheless, in the decades that followed, the Brewery Workers Union had constantly to guard against raids by the Teamsters and to fight even against the Federation itself.

In 1933, as the prospects for employment in the brewing industry suddenly brightened, the Federation officially transferred jurisdiction over the beer-wagon drivers to the International Brotherhood of Teamsters. The Brewery Workers, defying the Federation, refused to surrender their drivers, and took the case into the courts. In settling the issue the court based its verdict on the original understanding between the Brewery Workers Union and the Federation all the way back in 1887. The technicality that now came to benefit the Brewery Workers was that when they entered the Federation they had refused to accept a "charter" and insisted on taking merely a "certificate of affiliation." This signified that their union was not a subordinate of the larger group. The coming together was merely a banding together for mutual assistance. Reasoning from this the court ruled that the Federation lacked the right to order the union to divest itself of the drivers. But while the Federation might not have had a legally enforceable right, it was not altogether without power. Its leaders thought that perhaps the way to make the Brewery Workers Union hand over its "teamsters" was to suspend the union until it complied. Rather than yield, the union withdrew from the Federation in 1940.

Thus, so far as the continuity of its traditions was concerned, the union remained until World War II the organization created by the early "brewers." The jurisdictional struggle was dormant during the war and came to life only at its end. Meanwhile the power of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters had increased considerably and the Teamsters began not only to sign up beer truck drivers but to press for contracts covering all brewery workers. When on June 29, 1946, the United Brewery

Workers voted to affiliate with the CIO, it was largely in self-protection against the Teamsters. Indeed the locals in New York City fended off the Teamster assaults successfully for some time. In 1949, after the strike in which they won their first seniority clause, workers in 12 breweries and beer-distribution plants voted, by a margin of 5310 to 128, in favor of a union shop for the CIO. In spite of this show of strength, the New York locals went over to the Teamsters only four years later. The victory the Teamsters had sought for over thirty years was now theirs.

How did this metamorphosis come about? And did this change in union control affect the Negro's chances in the brewery industry?

2. From kegs to cans. The power of the Teamsters' upsurge has undoubtedly something to do with the change in beer consumption habits. Draught beer is, as most beer-drinkers know, on the way out. Gone are the days when the fancy keg-wagons with their teams of horses drove up to the local saloon and the driver delivered and tapped the keg before driving on. Mechanization, war shortages, the demise of the old-time saloon, new methods of refrigeration, the automobile, suburban living, all-purpose chain stores, and a number of other factors have meant a change in merchandising. With growing emphasis on the home, beer has become a household item shopped for by women. Where before prohibition only 25 percent of the beer sold in the United States was packaged, by 1945 some 62 percent was packaged or canned beer, and the percentage has since been rising. The switch to packaged beer has had a number of significant repercussions in the industry with regard to the seasonality of employment and the ratio of men employed in brewing departments (brewers) to men employed in bottling and distribution departments (teamsters). Especially this change in relative numbers has had a lot to do with power relations among the locals within the union.

"Old hands" -- denoting the old-timers in the industry and their spiritual heirs -- are found mostly in separate "brewers' locals." These locals descend directly from those founded by the first German brewery workers, Local 1 having been the first local of brewery workers in the country. Here ingroup tradition remains alive. The locals are said to be rather tightly knit, pretty much stabilized in number, taking in few casuals, and training young apprentices only as they are needed. In view of this, the entry of new workers into the brewing industry has been, since the end of World War II, largely by way of the "non-brewer," or what we have called "teamsters'" locals.

The teamsters' locals in the Brewery Workers Union have had practically a monopoly on casuals hired in the industry for some time. Most Group III workers (casuals) are referred to the breweries by locals controlling the bottling, bottle delivery, and warehouse departments. For instance, of the 272 Group III workers who, in the fall of 1953, had 100 or more days toward Group II status (that is, the fairly steady Group III workers), only 26 were employed in brewing departments. The remaining 246 were in "other than brewing departments" -- most of them under the jurisdiction of Bottlers and Drivers Union, Local 1345. And that local had indeed steadily increased in strength. By 1954 it was reported to have under its jurisdiction about half the production and distribution workers employed in New York.

3. The Teamsters' victory. The sequence of events which enabled the Teamsters to take over in New York sometime in late spring or early summer of 1953 is difficult to ascertain. Questioned about it, neither management representatives or rank-and-file members of the union exhibited concern or curiosity or, in some cases, even awareness that the brewery workers changed their affiliation. As far as the membership was concerned, control over the New York locals passed from the CIO Brewery Workers to the AFL Teamsters with hardly more than a sham skirmish.

Local 1345, which had grown so large, seems to have led the bolt. At least one report contains a hint that Local 1345 had gone over to the Teamsters while all the other locals were still affiliated with the original Brewery International. Apparently, officers in one local after another accepted positions with the International Brotherhood of Teamsters during 1953. Afterwards they simply moved their men into the AFL without first calling a disaffiliation meeting. This was in violation of their contractual agreements with the parent organization; the move was contested in court. When the case (*Feller* v. *Egelhofer*) was heard, October 16, 1953, the court instructed the mutinous officers to hand over union books, premises, and money to a group of trustees. Shortly after, in January 1954, the local officers held and won a regular election. Confronted with this *fait accompli* the trustees for the CIO disclaimed any interest in the proceedings, and the NLRB certified the Teamsters as the collective bargaining agent. There is hearsay evidence also that even before the January election the Teamsters reached an out-of-court settlement favorable to them.

This sudden and easy victory, after the years of contest, seems to have been primarily the outcome of technological change in the industry which gave numerical preponderance to teamsters (as opposed to brewers engaged in actual production) both within the local organization and on the national scene. The brewers could do little but bow to it.

4. The impact on "exclusion." The year the non-brewing unions really took over control of the brewery workers in New York thus coincided with the first real break in the pattern of exclusion that had characterized the industry up to now. One is tempted to suppose a logical connection between the two events -- for instance, to attribute the

change in policy in a more liberal direction to a succession of leaders[32] who held different views. There is indeed a relationship between these events but not one of cause and effect; and it was certainly not a "new enlightened leadership" which inaugurated a "new non-discriminatory policy."

What appears to have induced the change in policy was, first, the impairment of union solidarity and, second, the existence of legal pressures which could be brought to bear on recalcitrant unions. The first of these, the break-up of solidarity, played only an indirect role in making the union forces in toto more vulnerable in this time of crisis. This decreased resistance was reflected in a number of ways: For one thing, intra-union strife, feuds within the Joint Board, left the locals something less than united and thus lessened their collective bargaining strengths.[33] For their part, the brewers' locals, since they hired few casuals, had little to lose and only good will to gain by complying with the demands of Negro organizations in 1953 and, later in 1955, by settling complaints in conference with SCAD. The two large teamsters' locals, because they controlled the bulk of the casuals and thus most new workers, had the "most to lose." But as they were at different times at odds with the Joint Board, they could expect no real support from the old-time locals.

The ingroup made up of the hard core of old brewers was isolated; the solidarity of the old union which had allowed it to resist pressures from many sources, was gone. Indeed, in New York Local 1 of the Brewery Workers Union no longer existed.

Second, and of more direct significance for the change in policy, was the vulnerability before the law of the new teamsters' units. Local 1345 did not itself initiate the change. Since it controlled the entry of most new workers into the field, it would actually have been in a position to break with the past history of exclusion. But rather than leading the way through fair hiring practices, the local waited until a second group of complaints was filed against it with SCAD in 1954.[34] If the policy was changed, it was through the formal airing of these charges. As SCAD summed up its accomplishment in 1955: These "unlawful discriminatory practices ... were eliminated by conference, conciliation, and persuasion with respect to all of the respondents *with the exception of one labor organization* [my italics]."[35] That organization was Local 1345. While they could have led the way, the officers of the local decided to go along with the rest of the locals and the brewers only after formal proceedings had commenced.

---

[32] The same officials did remain in office but they were, of course, a "new leadership."

[33] When three officials of the Joint Board invoked the Fifth Amendment in a hearing before the House Un-American Activities Committee, Local 1345 disaffiliated itself on the grounds of Communist influence on the Board. The Board itself was strongly split on the use of the Fifth Amendment. Locals 1345 and 1096 also engaged in jurisdictional disputes.

The capitulation of the recalcitrant local can only be understood if we note its vulnerability to legal sanction. Thus there was the possibility that, if the complaints were sustained, the complainants might ultimately win back pay lost by reason of discrimination from whoever was responsible. In that case, too, the Commission could, if it wanted to, invoke special provisions of the labor law and jeopardize the continued operation of the union within the state. Finally -- and this was, perhaps, the trump card of SCAD -- there was always the chance that the legality of the collective bargaining agreement by which the union maintained its control over hiring would be brought into question: Did it legally circumvent the Taft-Hartley law, or was it in violation of the closed shop clause of that postwar law? The union obviously had no stomach for putting the agreement to a legal test.

This connection between the Taft-Hartley law and the elimination of discrimination deserves a special note. Paradox that it may seem, Taft-Hartley, anathema as it was to organized labor in the United States, had certain provisions which were a source of hope to those who fought against discrimination in industry. The restrictions it put on the closed shop granted greater freedom to employers in hiring, and these same provisions could be used to obtain entry for latecomers into an industry. Negroes thus might use it as an opening wedge in their fight for entry. On the whole, such hopes with regard to the Taft-Hartley law have not materialized. For where unions have intended to discriminate against minority groups, they have found ways to do so notwithstanding the law. In the brewery case before SCAD, however, the existence of this statute made itself felt in quite a different way: The charge that the agreement violated the law was not raised -- but it was there for the raising. Evidently Local

---

[34] See Part III.

[35] SCAD *1955 Report of Progress*, New York, 1956, p. 25.

1345 (and the other locals, one supposes) was not anxious for a public test and acted accordingly.

To summarize, then, the breakdown in the pattern of non-integration can be traced to the convergence of a number of long-run changes, accentuated after World War II:

> (1) A shrinking industry made both the brewers and the brewery workers economically vulnerable.
>
> (2) As a result, both industry and the unions moved to protect themselves through a collective bargaining agreement which included seniority rights for the "ins" and gave the industry built-in protection against the guaranteeing of recall rights to "too many" workers.
>
> (3) More than ever industry found itself dependent on advertising and good public relations, and therefore became more vulnerable to bad public relations.
>
> (4) Stiff competition among breweries,
>
> (5) and the growth of an important Negro market for beer products,
>
> (6) made the breweries particularly vulnerable to economic boycott, unfavorable publicity, and other pressures
>
> (7) by Negro organizations, which had grown economically and politically more powerful during the last decade.
>
> (8) Meanwhile, the once powerful ingroup, having all but disappeared, had neither the incentive nor the power to stop "integration,"
>
> (9) and the new union was vulnerable to legal pressure.
>
> (10) Finally, in 1945 SCAD had been created and, for the first time, those who suffered from discrimination had a legal redress.

III. PRESENT PROBLEMS AND LESSONS OF THE CASE

The Brewery Case (1955)

On March 28, 1955, SCAD opened a formal hearing into charges of unlawful discriminatory practices against the Bottlers and Drivers Union, Local 1345 of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, AFL. In general, the charge was that: (1) Negro registrants, although now referred for employment, were not being given a fair share of referrals because of their race and color; (2) because of this, Negro registrants were prevented from reaching the employment seniority status known in the industry as Group II.

After three additional days of hearings in April the proceedings were terminated upon the basis of a stipulation under which the union agreed to the entry of a consent decree against it for the purpose of eliminating those discriminatory practices. The case against the union involved two kinds of proof: first, proof of intent, that is, evidence that Negroes were not being given a fair share of referrals and were deliberately being kept from accumulating enough time to achieve seniority; second, proof of effect, that is, evidence that the referral practices, regardless of intent, operated in a discriminatory manner. The question of intent -- since the hearing terminated abruptly -- was never resolved, but the proof of effect lies in the facts of exclusion which we have pointed to in Part I. One direct result of the hearing was that SCAD, in cooperation with the unions, was able to require a full-scale reorganization of the entire registration and referral system in the industry along lines which it had worked out before.

Our interest here is not in reviewing the entire case but in detailing how, prior to the intervention of SCAD, the referral practices reinforced the pattern of non-integration, how the practices were altered as a result of the hearings, what happened after the end of the case, and what problems still remain.

1. The referral system. Almost since their inception, the Brewery Workers locals have reserved to themselves the right to refer men to the breweries when workers are needed. This control of referrals has not only allowed the union to regulate effectively the entry of new men into the industry and thus to protect its autonomy; it has also protected the would-be union member in his job-seeking. Had there not been some system of pooled hiring, anybody desiring a day's work would have had to make the round of all the breweries (located at some distance from each other) during the very early morning hours to see where work might be available. For many this would have been virtually impossible. Similarly, each brewery would have faced its own problem of ensuring that a sufficient number of applicants were available exactly when needed. Both labor and

management found advantages in the idea of hiring centralized in the unions.

In the 1940s hiring worked in this manner: In the brewers' locals, would-be workers registered with the union. They were contacted by the union if work became available. More permanent jobs were filled through a system of apprenticeship, in the traditional manner of craft unions. Where locals had jurisdiction over departments hiring a good many casual workers, they established hiring-halls. Sometimes a room was actually provided for this purpose (as at Local 1345). Other locals simply used as their "hiring-hall" the sidewalk outside their premises. Each morning workers who had previously registered with the union and wanted work shaped at the hall. Upon receiving orders for men from the various breweries, paid union officials -- dispatchers -- called men out of the shape and referred them to the breweries, where they were hired. When the particular job for which they were taken on was finished, they could return to shape the hall for another referral.[36]

Up until 1953 there was no real referral system. Dispatchers said usually they just called out men whose faces they recognized, who had been shaping the hall for some time. Time for the shape-up was generally understood to be about six to ten in the morning but nobody seemed to care much how nearly the schedule was met. Obviously, in the absence of formal rules and regulations and in the absence of systematic records, intent to discriminate or the discriminatory effect of referral practices was difficult to check. As a first step in breaking the historical pattern of exclusion SCAD saw the need to formalize referral practices and establish written records; these would allow for a check on discriminatory practices. The bare essentials of reform and supervision were effected during 1953. Locals were ordered to have men sign in when they reported at the hall, and the dispatchers were required to keep lists of men sent out each day as well as the sequence in which they were sent out. The gist of the system was to be "first come, first served" -- according to particular skills required-- without reference to race, color, creed, or national origin. Discriminatory practices which originated in the arbitrariness and personal prejudices of dispatchers were to be kept in check.

The Urban League, it may be remembered, was also observing at the hiring-halls at this time. It did not, like SCAD, however press for an orderly system of referral which would provide against arbitrary practices prejudicial to Negroes. Rather, through its campaign for a quota agreement, it sought to gain special consideration for Negroes, to havea certain number referred to particular jobs. By 1954, however, Negro leaders, recognizing that what was needed was a full-scale reorganization of the entire registration and referral system, came to the same conclusion as SCAD. Referral had to be on the basis of merit -- whatever the color of a man's skin -- and within the limits of human fallibility, the system had to allow the dispatcher a range of choice as limited as possible.

---

[36] In many casual jobs the worker must go back to the hiring-hall for referral even though the brewery expects to rehire him for an additional day.

2. Referral practices before SCAD. There were four principal means by which the union could use its referral practices to discriminate against Negroes -- or, for that matter, against anyone not in favor with the ingroup. The first three, if utilized, kept the Negro from accumulating time in the industry; use of the fourth would make it certain that he did not achieve seniority status and union membership.

a. Evading the system. Union regulations required an applicant to appear at the hall in order to be referred. But there were means of getting around this provision. Dispatchers might telephone men not present and so send them out to work nevertheless, or some men might be hired directly by the breweries. Negroes complained that white men were able to obtain employment directly since they "knew somebody" at the brewery. Also, breweries might request a particular man from the union. (Representatives of one brewery admitted that this was sometimes done, but only occasionally; they did not want to be obliged to the union any more than necessary.) Moreover, men might be hired at "illegal" shape-ups or in the absence of a shape-up. Sometimes, it was charged, men were directed to or hired directly by the breweries for midnight shifts after the hall had closed for the day. All hiring was supposed to be during the morning house, but afternoon shape-ups would be held after Negroes had been informed there were no calls from the breweries and had left the hall.

In some ways hiring "outside the system" could, as in 1953, be said to operate to favor Negroes. The quota agreement honored the rule that men must be present at the shape-up before they were referred, but stories made the rounds that at least one brewery actually called back to work Negroes who had not reported at the hiring-hall. Whatever truth there was to this charge, the Urban League made strenuous efforts to get men down to the hall in time to be referred out; the letter of the "law" which required men to shape the hall was stretched, but the system itself was not evaded. The opportunities for evasion from the other side, however, were at least equally great.

b. The personal equation. Personal prejudice, too, might enter into discriminatory referral practices. One hears that one dispatcher, more than another, was friendly to Negroes. Or a few Negroes might become "pets" or show-pieces while all others were discriminated against. According to such claims, few Negroes or only a few favored Negroes might be referred for work while a particular dispatcher was in charge; when, for one reason or another, another dispatcher took over, Negroes would suddenly be called out of the shape-up. The union did of course concede that the personal element entered the picture, but maintained that sometimes it operated to favor Negroes. An occasional dispatcher might lean over backward in order not to appear to discriminate. There were good and not-so-good workmen among the Negroes, union representatives pointed out, and though dispatchers preferred Negroes with good work records, they nevertheless referred out Negroes against whom other workers and employers had complained.

Did the personal attitudes of other workers affect the actions of dispatchers? Some Negroes spoke of sensing the hostility of white men in the shape-up, especially when Negroes first started appearing for referral in some numbers. Did the dispatcher sense and heed this alleged hostility? The dispatcher was an elected and paid official of the union. Group III men who shaped were not usually union members and had no influence on union policy -- or union elections. The dispatcher was naturally more sensitive to pressures from other union members (and especially active members -- the officialdom) than to the feelings of Group III men. Indeed the latter had no influence on the dispatcher, but rather depended on him for the attainment of status. The directives from other officials with regard to the referrals of Negroes might enter decisively into the dispatcher's actions; at the same time he might be inclined to favor those men of whose future allegiance he was most certain.

c. The indirect method. A third mechanism through which discrimination against Negroes might be effected lay in a form of harrassment. In this case, Negroes would be referred out to jobs which were virtually impossible for them to take or which made working conditions as undesirable as possible. For example, it was claimed that drivers at one brewery, due to overtime, could expect (as of 1955) to get about $46 a day compared to the normal $29 or $30 a day a driver in other breweries might make. The Negro would be sent to the latter breweries. Again, since delivery departments have no set shifts, the earlier a worker starts to deliver a given load, the earlier he is through. There were complaints that Negroes would be sent out later in the morning than the whites and thus get through late at night. Negroes were sometimes assigned to out-of-the-way plants. A complainant in 1952 alleged that a number of times he had been sent out to suburban plants on a late shift where he could not get a train home until the next morning. This same man called himself a victim of yet another form of harrassment: He was given a truck, told to deliver a load of beer, and not informed of his route, thus making his job impossible and encouraging failure.

d. Lowering the boom. The most effective way to keep Negroes out of the industry was to keep them from "bridging the gap." What does it avail a man, the Negro might ask, to accumulate 249 days of work in one department of one brewery, a point which few ever reached, only to see his time wiped out during the slow season? The boom is effectively lowered, as we have related,[37] if the worker is not reemployed at least one day a month in that particular department and that particular brewery during the slow season. A break of more than 30 days wipes out the accumulated time toward Group II status.

A look at a few comparative statistics from the files of SCAD for Negroes and whites will at once show how the boom was most commonly lowered on the Negro. The proportion of Negroes shaping the hall before and during 1953 who made Group II status by 1954 was smaller than that of whites. Of men who in the fall of 1953 had 100 or more days toward Group II status, 23 percent of the whites and only 8 percent of the Negroes kept their time over the slow season to make Group II status by 1954. Referral practices might affect the chances of a man for bridging the gap and thus work both directly and indirectly to keep Negroes from gaining seniority status and becoming union members. In other words, however enlightened union referral practices during the busy season might appear, they could nevertheless ensure the continuity of the policy of exclusion.

Of five breweries operating in 1953-54 there were two -- Schaefer's and Schlitz -- where it was virtually impossible to keep one's time over the slow season. Referral to these breweries during the busy season, no matter how steady, meant no chance to gain seniority status.

In the other three breweries chances for bridging the slow season differed according to department. The best chance was in the brewing department. Of those who accumulated their 100 days there in 1953, over 75 percent went on to accumulate the full 250 days without a 30-day interruption, and thereby gained Group II status by 1954. The hitch was that few men got casual or seasonal permanent jobs in brewing; only 10 percent of the men who had accumulated 100 days in the industry by the fall of 1953 worked in the brewing departments. In view of this, the majority of casuals could work toward Group II status through employment only in the keg delivery, bottle delivery, and warehouse departments of three breweries: Liebmann, Ruppert, and Piel.[38]

---

[37] See page 209.

[38] No reference is made here to checking and dispatching jobs in the breweries, since these are as yet not within the jurisdiction of these unions.

The most obvious means of subtle or hidden discrimination would have been not to refer Negroes to the delivery and warehouse departments of certain breweries during the busy season, but to refer them to departments and plants where the boom could be effectively lowered during the slow season without any need to discriminate openly during that period. In other words, there would simply be no calls for workers during the slow season from those departments to which they had been referred for employment during the busy season.

But even if Negroes were given assignments during the busy season in departments where chances of bridging the slow season were relatively good, they could be effectively barred from status by failing to send them back to the same department at least one day in any 30-day period during the off-season. Is there any evidence of such direct and deliberate discrimination?

When we consider all the men who had accumulated 100 days or more by fall 1953 in non-brewing departments, we find that 75 of 224 whites (about 1 out of 3) kept their time and made Group II; only 1 of 22 Negroes did so. Of those who had worked 100 days or more in bottle delivery departments other than Schlitz (where all lost their time), all but 1 of 32 whites made Group II compared with only 1 or 3 Negroes. (The number of Negroes is too small, of course, to allow for statistical "proof" of discrimination during the slow season.) Again, all those employed in keg delivery departments kept their time, but no Negroes had accumulated time in these departments. All 9 Negroes who worked in the bottling department of Ruppert lost their time; about 2/5 of the whites who accumulated their time in that particular department bridged the gap. On the assumption that the Negroes in this department shaped the hall regularly during the slow month -- and we have every reason to think they did -- this constitutes some evidence that, though Negroes were referred for jobs during the busy season, they were not referred back during the slow months and were thus barred from acquiring seniority status.

3. Reform and after. SCAD, with the cooperation of the unions, sought to reform the referral system so as to eliminate all arbitrary choice. The new system was to be based on the seniority of applicants for brewery jobs. As a first step in this direction each registrant was assigned a priority status. A review of work records of Group III men (casuals) resulted in the drawing up of a list indicating the date on which each had first registered for work in the industry. Registration numbers were assigned with the lowest number going to the earliest registrant and so on down the line. Each man was then given the stub from his registration card, showing his name, address, and registration number -- proof of the priority he held in the shape-up. In addition, registrants were assured of some check on their own status relative to others at any particular shape-up. A bound workbook was to be maintained in the local union office. In it were

listed the name and registration number of all men in the order they had registered. This book was to be open for examination by registrants at any reasonable time. A current list together with a full statement of the rules covering referrals were also required to be posted on the wall of the main room of the hiring hall.

Referrals were first of all to follow group status (Group I before Group II, Group II before III; within each group the order of referral followed priority established by registration date. But there were certain exceptions. For example, when an employer sent in a request for men with chauffeur licenses and men with chauffeur trucking experience, the order of priority was to apply only to those men having the requisite experience. This experience was noted on registration cards and stubs. In the case of employer requests for men with experience as trailer, "hi-lo" or jockey drivers, or as soakers, washers, fillers, labelers, or packers, and other jobs defined as requiring special skills, the union might ask the company for the names of men it had previously employed on such jobs and these men were then given referral priority. The order in which men appeared at the shape-up and the frequency of their appearances were not to affect their priority status.[39] In addition, so as to help him acquire his Group II status, a Group III man who had accumulated 225 or more days in a particular plant and department was, according to the rules, to be sent back, whenever possible, to the same plant and department. For these jobs such a Group III man had referral priority over all other men in his group.

Registrants were to sign a daily list to show their presence in the shape-up (indicating also their group status, job skills, and plants desired) and to give the dispatcher their registration stubs with their numbers. The registration stub was returned to an applicant each day when he left the union office. The union was to fill job orders from among registrants present in the shape-up, according to priority, with the daily list and the registration stubs establishing each man's claim.

In this referral plan there was an obvious booby trap. Negroes had been discriminated against in the past; they were latecomers to the industry; so that most would hold high numbers and thus low priority.

---

[39] That is, no one could expect to gain favors by being always around, but under certain conditions the priority status could lapse. These varied between locals. Local 1345 required registrants to be referred out at least once every six months. In Local 1 (which incidentally had no shape), priority could be maintained as long as the registrant appeared for referral at least once every year.

The past record of exclusion was likely to be formalized into the system. But the order entered by SCAD against the unions and the employers took account of this pitfall. Nineteen Negroes were admitted to Group II status, even though they had not met the 250 day/one-month requirement. They were granted this seniority because it was recognized that if discriminatory practices had not worked against them, they would by now have attained it. And in the assignment of registration numbers, evidence that Negroes had ever been kept from registering was also taken into consideration.

SCAD records show that the changeover was carried out with relatively little difficulty by the majority of locals. The systematizing of referrals was more trouble for the locals handling a good many casuals. Local 1096 (Bottlers and Drivers) required a great deal of assistance from SCAD personnel, and Local 1345 (with 14 of the 19 Negroes who were given Group II status) also experienced considerable difficulty in ordering its registrants. How successfully has the new system worked? Have the discriminatory practices been eliminated?

In the first sixteen months following the hearing ten complaints alleging discrimination because of color were filed with SCAD. The substance of these complaints was pretty much the same as before the hearing. No matter how early Negroes appeared at the hall, charged one, the dispatcher held up referrals until whites with lower numbers appeared. There were reports of lay-offs out of sequence, which deprived some employees of the right to become Group II workers.[40] A good share of these early complaints came from Negroes who had come too late to advance into Group II. After 1956 complaints became more sporadic. Occasionally a Negro still avowed that at one time or another he had not been referred while workers with less priority were called. Verifying the allegations underlying such complaints was virtually impossible -- of this, more later.

According to the information available at this writing not one Negro has achieved seniority status since 19 were absorbed into the industry following the 1955 hearing. Industrial reorganization, further mechanization, increased truck loads, changes in distribution pattern -- all these have kept to a minimum the number of new men making Group II status. But the advance to this seniority status has not been completely halted.

---

[40] According to industry rules, an employee with 90 days of continuous service can only be laid off in accordance with the length of service rather than by priority number.

Then has the new system ended discrimination? There are still a few -- though only a few -- official complaints of discriminatory treatment on account of color. Negroes are referred out and they work during the busy season. They are no longer excluded; yet Negroes have failed to gain seniority status in the industry on a par with white workers. How can we account for this?

To understand the situation of the Negro brewery worker we may turn for a moment to consider some white workers. Soon after the brewery hearing ended in 1955 we began to hear of a "Committee of 100," the "Committee for Equal Rights," as its members called it. This rump organization of casual workers protested that they too were being discriminated against by the union. SCAD could not, of course, do anything about their complaint since discrimination on the basis of race, color, creed, or national origin was not alleged. "Who, then," the men asked, "protects the white worker against union discrimination? The Negroes have SCAD but we have nobody." Their cry, sometimes interpreted as a protest against the grant of status to 19 Negroes,[41] did dramatize the real gain, the important victory, the Negroes had achieved in the brewery case. The Negro, in his quest for a place in the brewery industry, was no longer a weak supplicant; he had an outside authority to oversee his rights.

The specific complaints of the Committee for Equal Rights also help to clarify the problems the Negro still faces before he can hope to have more than a toehold in the industry. The Negro (together with a good many whites) faces the same problem which plagued the efforts of Negroes to break into the industry during prohibition and depression. There is a new ingroup anxious to consolidate its position. Though elsewhere industries may be expanding, the number of permanent jobs in the brewing industry, in relation to the number of Group III men who are anxious to get them, is limited. Men already in the union are seeking to secure these positions (and the seniority which goes with them) for their friends, relatives, and other contacts. Some workers allude to corruption -- meaning that dispatchers exchange jobs for drinks, money, and favors. We also hear of deliberate discrimination against Negroes and others who are approaching the 250-day goal. A worker as he reaches 225 days secures, for the benefit of union officials, a statement to that effect from his brewery. Some say this is a mistake; don't let them know you're that close or you're a dead duck. There may be a certain amount of swapping favors -- not corruption as it is generally defined -- and there may be instances of deliberate discrimination. But what the Negroes and all who would enter the industry are now up against seems to be not corruption, not deliberate discrimination, but favoritism mainly in the form of nepotism.

---

[41] Some viewed the committee's move as anti-Negro. While some of the members probably were prejudiced and resentful of the Negro victory, some of the leaders, who were against discrimination on principle, simply were using the Negro gain to press their own case.

If the referral system now operates according to priority laid down by the rules and if arbitrary choice is out, how is such favoritism possible? The answer is that the registration and referral system has ruled out only the most blatant discrimination and whim. Some men continue to raise the charge that built-in checks are inadequate, that there is no self-policing system in which the men themselves can exercise control. Subterfuges are allowed by three kinds of practices not covered by the system, so men charged.

What makes control on the part of men in the hiring difficult is, first, their lack of certain knowledge about who is being called out for what job. The man shaping the hall knows only that certain men are called out from time to time and that he himself holds a registration number which establishes his priority relative to others. But even the man with high priority is not entitled to be referred to all jobs solely by virtue of this priority, since some jobs require skills which make ineligible many a brewery worker, however high his priority. On some occasions also, men are called back to their breweries, a privilege they enjoy after accumulating 225 days and which, for the particular job, gives them priority over all other men with Group III status. If a man with lower priority than his own is called out the individual brewery worker is hard put to find out whether these are "exceptions" going back to their breweries or whether they possess skills the lack of which disqualifies him from the particular job. Unlike the hiring hall of the National Maritime Union, where an available job is always announced, the brewery worker does not know against whom he is competing with regard to a specific job. In the Maritime Union all who wish to be considered for the specific job "bid" by throwing in their stubs (or the equivalent), and the job goes to the eligible with the highest priority. The losers all know why they have lost; they know the skills required for the job and the number held by the winner. Consequently, if there is discrimination, the victim can immediately protest. But to the brewery worker suspicious of being discriminated against in the hiring hall it may seem futile, and even foolish, to file a complaint unless he can first check on the skills and registration numbers of men called out before him, as well as on the nature of the jobs that are being filled. By the time he is able to collect this information, he may well miss out on his own call.

Herein lies the second reason why checks on alleged discrimination or the violation of priority rules are said to be difficult: Workers sign in but *do not sign out* of the hall. A complaint to the dispatcher may net this answer: "But we called you; you were out of the hall," against which there is little proof. Further, how do you prove that a man who was sent out on a day you were shaping the hall definitely was *not* in the hall? He may have signed in early but he was not around when the job came up. If a dispatcher wanted to discriminate, he could get in touch with men with higher priority numbers even though they had left the hall.

Finally, there are allegations of occasional illegal shape-ups, of men called on the telephones, of jobs and men that never openly go through the hiring hall. Though lists are kept, the checking of a complaint -- particularly after some time has elapsed -- is for the individual brewery worker a difficult matter. Quite evidently the referral system precludes wholesale discrimination. What men -- both Negroes and whites -- privately allege and are trying to document is the favoring of certain workers which in effect works to discriminate against all the others. The union, transmuted and a new ingroup, is trying to hold its own. Workers with sons and nephews and friends, who are accumulating time toward seniority status, check with the personnel office to see how their boys are doing and to see that they get a break. Negroes, like others who are not on the fringe of the ingroup, become the victims of a referral system which makes it possible for those others to get a break. Jobs are limited, and only so many can get them.

We may evaluate reform after SCAD this way: Where discrimination on account of color can be established, the Negroes now have a protector of their rights in SCAD. But the latest complaints have alleged discrimination on grounds of national origin rather than color. Along with others, some Negroes are fighting for a stronger toehold in an industry which still bears the character of an ingroup. Today the main issue is favoritism, and it may be significant that some Negroes have now joined the Committee for Equal Rights, the group within the union which is seeking to incorporate a built-in policing system into the referral rules.

While a number of Negroes made a clear breakthrough, the majority of Negroes seeking entry still share the disadvantages resulting from past exclusion. Whether the responsibility of SCAD ends with this clear break in the pattern of deliberate and flagrant exclusion is a real question. For the possibility remains that Negroes in the same position of all other newcomers may press for further legal backing in overcoming what obstacles to free entry into the brewery industry remain. Of greatest significance in this respect is the elimination of color as an explicit barrier to employment, although our figures showed that even after the opening of the industry, Negroes advanced to Group II status in smaller proportions than whites. We cannot say whether this is because of clandestine discrimination or simply because *so far* the favoritism on the part of the ingroup still works predominantly to advance to seniority status persons other than Negroes. On the other hand, the elimination of all inequities which result from entrenchment in certain economic positions, in this case the building up of an ingroup in a vulnerable and unskilled trade, hardly seems an issue which involves SCAD, unless of course the monopoly is squarely aimed against persons on grounds of their race, creed, color, or national origin. These and similar issues will be discussed in the next section.

The Lessons of the Brewery Case Study: Some General Observations

1. In general we expect Negroes, like other minorities, to experience least difficulty in securing positions involving little skill and no prestige. Here is a notable exception. Negroes were, for many decades, excluded from the relatively unskilled jobs in the brewery industry. At the root of the long history of their exclusion was the fact that a militant union turned a low-paying unskilled job into a desirable one and made "employment in the brewing industry" a craft and then, according to the character of craft unions, turned against rising minority groups who were seen as a threat to their status. This exception should perhaps make us re-examine our generalization; more important is that it suggests that the escape or avoidance of poorly paid and unskilled jobs is not the only way out of an underprivileged economic position. "Somebody," the industrial sociologist tells us, "must do the dirty work" -- and it has too often been done by the marginal man, the man with the different skin, creed, national origin. Negroes today still occupy low-paying service positions out of proportion to their numbers in the labor force. In improving their economic lot Negroes might wisely devote more effort to organizing these service workers and translating the work into a craft as another underprivileged group, the brewery workers, did so long ago.

2. In line with the above, we have noted a reversed pattern of discrimination in the brewery industry. The color line with regard to clerical workers was broken before the color line in the production and distributive phases of the industry. And yet there was no comparable effort to press the case for Negroes in white-collar jobs. Should not the various Negro organizations and the Negro workers have used the employment of white-collar workers in the industry more vigorously? To crack a hard nut may be the greater challenge, but advances are made where the greatest vulnerability exists.

3. Further, we may ask why this industry was chosen as a focal point for a struggle against discrimination in industry. The hearing on the complaints charging discrimination in the brewery industry constitutes the terminal point for a number of pressures. Throughout the history of this effort to gain entry it has been evident that the motives of

the Negro pressure groups differed from those of potential employees, and that the interests of the employees and those of the union ingroup were in many respects dissimilar. In other words, there was not a completely united front either among the white or among the Negro groups. These divergences were aggravated by the fact that the brewing industry is a declining industry. While brewers thus were vulnerable to pressure from the Negro market, they needed also to satisfy to some extent the demands of workers who depended on the industry for a livelihood. Similarly, the lack of prestige of manual brewery jobs and the casual nature of the employment surely hindered the rapid flow of Negro workers into the industry. But as long as the industry was vulnerable and the minority group had not only opinion but legal force to back it, both union and management, eager to maintain their status quo in other respects, could be induced to give in.

4. Thus the weapon on which the Urban League drew in its fight against discrimination among the brewery workers was publicity. Publicity, however, is not always effective nor can those who fight discrimination in industry put too much faith in the arousal of moral indignation or the awakening of some amorphous force called "public opinion." Publicity, as employed by the League, had two specific aims: to arouse some indignation in the Negro community (in particular), and to remind the brewery managements of their stake in the Negro market. Inasmuch as the League and the United African Nationalist Movement had worked so long at cross-purposes with each other, it may seem a bitter irony that it was the activities of the UANM which ultimately made the League's publicity a success. For any moral indignation on the part of the Negro community at the pattern of non-integration could not be brought home to the breweries unless it was through the economic effects of the boycotts which the UANM imposed. Though not a necessary prelude to the use of legal proceedings, the publicity of the League, backed by the boycott, did much to soften the brewers and make them amenable to terms.

5. One important lesson of the case must surely be the need for minorities pressing for the end to exclusion and discrimination to keep in mind the long-run view, however morally indignant they feel and no matter how pressed they are for results. Those against whom discrimination is practiced cannot afford to champion discrimination against others. In the long run both the UANM and the Urban League had to abandon efforts to arrive at a quota agreement and to work, through SCAD, for getting employment in the brewery industry based on merit without regard to race, color, creed, or national origin. Wherever there is discrimination in industry it is the *pattern of discrimination* which must be altered -- and this cannot be altered through a *pattern of mutual discrimination*.

6. Likewise, we must question the cry of the UANM, sometimes echoed by other minorities (including nationalist groups), that it is "our rights before the rights of all others" -- in this case, "the rights of

Negroes trying to enter the industry before the seniority rights of other brewery workers." The rights of minorities, including the right to fight against discrimination, are closely tied to the rights that workers have won to organize and protect their working conditions. Most advances in ethical standards and the standard of living in a country have, in the long run, meant improvements in the status of oppressed groups. Similarly, it may be asked, did not the very conditions which made the brewery industry so vulnerable also impede speedy integration? New workers are attracted and most easily absorbed into expanding industries. If, in addition, special skills possessed by some minority applicants are in high demand, this not only means that no ingroup positions are threatened but entails a promise of gain in status for the minority as well. Pacemakers are most apt to be channeled into such expanding industries.

7. The problem of why Negroes and members of other minority groups sometimes respond to appeals for pacemakers in industrial integration and why they sometimes do not is another significant question for study. Here we are up against the vicious circle of discrimination by which Negroes are excluded from jobs in an industry and then the industry becomes identified as a white man's industry: The Negro no longer applies even when it begins to become evident that the barriers need only a push to come down. Would the pattern of exclusion in the brewery industry have been changed sooner if Negroes in some numbers had consistently shaped the hiring-halls before 1952? Would the quota agreement of 1953 have been fulfilled if more Negroes had shaped the hall, especially during the slow months? And how many Negroes are at the shape-ups in 1957? "Quite a few," we hear, during the busy season, which is under way at this writing. Will they continue to appear during the slow months to come? Or will many forego by their absence their chances for attaining seniority?

This raises the larger problem of who can afford to be a pacemaker. The young unmarried female, asked by the Urban League to apply for a job which is traditionally a white job, can afford to take a chance and try time and again. She may even be induced to spend years acquiring skills and education for a job she may never get, but the rewards seem greater in that white-collar position than in an unskilled beer production or distributor's job. What about the Negro male, from 25 to 35, with a family to support -- can he afford to shape the hall each day without referral, to gamble for income that is so uncertain? Even if he gets work during the busy season, can he pass up steady work elsewhere during the winter season in quest of that one day's work a month he needs for seniority?[42] The young with little to lose and few economic responsibilities can best afford to be pacemakers; they are apt to respond to appeals for applicants, especially if the appeal comes directly from the potential employer (as in advertisements for telephone workers). The more mature worker, unless he is ideologically dedicated, will be more cautious. He will be doubly so if the appeal comes not from the employing agency itself but from an organization which is seeking pacemakers. Quite evidently, many who might be highly motivated to serve the cause of Negro integration are deterred by the economic sacrifices involved. If the community provided not only moral backing but also economic support, it might be easier to recruit people to set the pace.

---

[42] To be sure, Group II status does not necessarily mean year-round work, but so as to bridge the slow season and accumulate his days toward Group II status, the casual must constantly be on call.

8. The case illustrates the operation of pressure group tactics, each side gaining or losing strength not only as its public support held or waned but also as industrial conditions changed. We have characterized the "causes" of the pattern of exclusion as attempts on the part of an ingroup to protect its own interest in time of crisis. We have found ourselves dealing not with an intent to discriminate but with activity, geared to the self-interest of industry and union, which brought about a pattern of discrimination. The implications can easily be seen: Groups interested in changing a pattern of discrimination can do well to concentrate less on the intent to discriminate than on the conditions under which discrimination arises.

If we are to understand a case of discrimination, the immediate facts must be supplemented with the history of what has gone before. This approach can lead to a clearer recognition of the interests various groups seek to protect and of the points at which they are most vulnerable and ready to give in. Measures to implement and enforce integration can be framed more realistically with the assumption that, on the whole, the groups guilty of discrimination are less interested in preserving the discriminatory pattern than in preserving the advantages they believe the pattern helps to protect.

9. To the outside observer studying the history of this case -- and especially the reaction to the Urban League agitation -- the union men may appear as the "bad guys" and the management representatives as the "good guys." Accordingly, the interest in perpetuating discrimination seemed to lie with the union men; management appeared willing to end discrimination except that their hands were tied and, much as they wanted to do something about all this, they could not. Such a view is far from fitting the case.

Actually on both sides there were those individuals here and there who were sympathetic and went out of their way to help in the fight against Negro exclusion. These were men who suggested to the Urban League that it might help if League representatives observed at the shape-ups; who reminded the League that, in pressing for a quota, Negroes themselves might be guilty of discrimination; who gave Negroes a break in the shape-up and on the job, and so forth. The importance of a well-intentioned individual in a position of leadership and strategically placed cannot be underestimated. But most individuals, to the extent that they work within a system such as a union or a managerial bureaucracy, are moved less by their individual prejudices than by their conception of the policies and interests of the organization of which they are a part. In this instance, these interests led union representatives toward actions discriminatory in effect and management officials to seek an enlightened policy.

The intent or the prejudices of any individual are strategically less important than the demands of the position which he occupies. He can be induced to act more readily through his organizational demands (such as the need of the industry to cultivate the Negro market) than by appeal to his conscience. A management representative talking about the number of Negro clerical workers in his brewery said quite clearly, "If we were down South or some place out West where they didn't have a big Negro market, we wouldn't have any. This way it's to our interest to employ them."

At the same time, management abetted the union because it was anxious to promote labor peace in the industry. In this way, it was clearly co-responsible with the union for the situation. Management was in the enviable position of being able, on the one hand, to proclaim to the nonwhite community its eagerness to integrate and, on the other, to point to union restrictions as an excuse for doing little to further integration. SCAD responded by making union and management joint respondents. However, the final hearing to enforce compliance was directed against Local 1345, the one recalcitrant local.

10. The role of a governmental commission against discrimination should be neither exaggerated nor unduly minimized. In this case, it is clear that SCAD could not at one blow eliminate the traditional pattern of exclusion from the brewery industry. Nor could it introduce a foolproof system of referral from which personal favoritism, nepotism, and sponsorship were completely struck out. In seeking entry into the brewery industry, the Negro had to fight the tradition of past discriminatory practices. Nonetheless the legal sanctions at SCAD's disposal were not without significant effect. The institutionalized practices by which the union, to some extent abetted by industry, sought to preserve its ingroup status were not isolated from the larger community. In the face of pressure and haunted by the possibility of legal action, the union was more ready to give in somewhat than to risk certain privileges it had won in the past. Settlement without open conflict with SCAD on the part of all but one local, left the position of the union fundamentally intact. But it could no longer discriminate with impunity.

Thus in the brewery case the advance toward integration came, first, by forcing a clear break with the past pattern with the admission of 19 nonwhite workers. Yet SCAD could not indefinitely rely on such measures for ultimate integration. Therefore it placed its faith in the alteration of a referral system which, in its arbitrariness and its uncertainties, had worked against all casual workers. This alteration of the system will not do away with all unfairness in hiring; nor will it eliminate every inequity following from the past history of exclusion. But it has gone a long way toward driving discrimination underground and giving the Negro a position from which he can compete on an equal basis -- even if not always successfully -- for the new openings in the industry. In other words, there comes a point at which the road toward integration can no longer be paved with individual redress given to individuals, but must rely primarily on such reforms as give more equal opportunity to all. The brewery case may, as one of its major lessons, drive home the need of recognizing in any specific situation exactly where that point is to be located.

Chapter VIII

PUERTO RICAN INTEGRATION IN THE SKIRT INDUSTRY IN NEW YORK CITY

Roy B. Helfgott

From the viewpoint of New York City's economic future, facilitating the entrance of Puerto Ricans into its industry is of vital importance. Their subsequent integration into trade unions is of equal importance to the future of New York's labor movement. This chapter seeks to analyze the steps taken by one local of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union to accomplish these ends.

I. PUERTO RICAN ENTRANCE INTO THE SKIRT INDUSTRY

The Skirt Industry

History. The skirt industry is a relatively old section of the American needle trades. It was an important section of the women's garment industry in the days before the first World War, when women wore long skirts with blouses, which were then known as shirtwaists. The change in fashions that followed the war, whereby women turned to the wearing of readymade dresses, led to a decline in the importance of the skirt industry.

The skirt industry continued as a small segment of the women's garment industry for the next few decades. In 1939 the total production of skirts in the United States was 13 million, the wholesale value of which was $22 million.

World War II also produced changes in women's fashions. This time, however, the changes resulted in a new growth for the skirt industry, which benefited from a "revolution in clothes." Part of the vast postwar changes in the American scene has been the trend away from formality to casualness. The tremendous growth of suburban communities, with over 30 million people now living in the suburban areas surrounding our great cities, has led to a more informal way of living, reflected in dress, particularly in the use of separates (skirts and blouses) and other sportswear.

As a result of this trend, the separate skirt industry has experienced steady growth during the past decade, as Table VIII-a demonstrates.

Table VIII-a. Production of Skirts, United States, Selected Years[a]

Year	Production per potential consumers	Unit production (millions)	Dollar volume (millions)
1939	.27	13.0	$22
1946	.40	21.5	$69
1952	1.16	66.6	$192
1953	1.26	72.9	$202
1954	1.30	75.8	$207
1955	1.39	82.8	$244

[a] International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, Report and Record, Twenty-ninth Convention, May 1956, pp. 73, 76, 77.

As us true with most women's garments, New York City is the leading center of skirt production in the nation, and accounts for most of the industry's output.

Structure. There is overlapping between the skirt industry and the coat and suit industry, since a segment of the former works directly in producing skirts for suit firms. The larger section, however, comprises a separate and distinct industry, skirts and sportswear, with its own employer associations, and its labor-management relations governed by its own collective agreements. This is the section that has experienced steady growth in the past decade and into which have come the Puerto Ricans in numbers.

As with other sections of the garment industry, the skirt and sportswear trade has three different types of employers. The first are the manufacturers who have "inside" shops, that is, they run their own production plants as well as sell garments. Next there are the "jobbers," who buy the raw materials, design the garments, and sell them, but do not actually manufacture them. The jobbers have showrooms, and usually a cutting room, but send the material to "outside" shops to be made into skirts. Both the manufacturers and jobbers generally belong to the National Skirt and Sportwear Association.

The last type of employer is the contractor, or submanufacturer, who runs an outside shop. He is in no way involved with the marketing of the product, but he has the operating shop and hires the workers, and is, in effect, a labor contractor. The contractors belong to the Greater Blouse, Skirt and Neckwear Contractors' Association, if in the separate skirt industry, or to the American Cloak and Suit Manufacturers' Association, if working in the coat and suit industry.

Economics. The skirt industry is a small-scale one, even by garment industry standards. The 8000 workers in the skirt and sportwear industry in New York City are distributed among 322 operating shops, an average of 25 workers per shop. Capital investment is small, the work is seasonal, and competition is keen. As a result there is a high mortality rate for firms in the industry. In recent years, continual expansion in response to the growing consumer demand has kept the adverse aspects of the industry's economics to a minimum.

Labor force. Historically, the labor force of the skirt industry was similar to that of the coat and suit industry, to which it is closely allied. From the beginning of the twentieth century it was composed of skilled male workers, mostly Jewish immigrants from Eastern Europe, plus some Italians. Another group which later found its way into the industry was the Spanish-speaking Sephardic Jews from Turkey and other places in the Mediterranean area. Still later, in the 1930s, Latin Americans, including Mexicans, Cubans, and Puerto Ricans, began to trickle into the skirt shops.

Reasons for Puerto Rican Entrance into the Skirt Industry

The postwar expansion of the separate skirt industry has seen a great change in the ethnic composition of its labor force. The upsurge in production resulted in a need for thousands of new workers. The former major source of manpower, Eastern European Jews, had dried up largely as a result of the restriction of immigration in the 1920s, and the immigrants' children did not enter the trade, except as cutters and pressers, the two crafts which are better paid and still attract American-born men.

The problem was not restricted to the skirt trade; the entire garment industry, always having been a center for immigrant labor, was now faced with the need for new ethnic groups. The skirt industry was most in need of operators, special machine operators, and floor workers.

New York City did offer a domestic source of labor in its Negro population, and many Negroes became skirtmakers, but not in sufficient number to fill the demand for labor.[1] A new immigrant group was needed. The only significant group coming into the country in the postwar period has been the Puerto Ricans, who, being American citizens, are not affected by restrictive immigration laws. Although the Puerto Rican is a citizen, and is thus technically an in-migrant rather than an immigrant, as far as adjustment is concerned he faces the same problems: climate, customs, job, language, living conditions, social organizations, and even his relationship with other ethnic groups, all of which are different from what he has previously known.[2]

Great expansion and the consequent need for more workers was thus the major reason for the entrance into the skirt industry of Latin Americans, primarily Puerto Ricans. This expansion provided not only jobs but jobs with decent earnings as compared to other semiskilled employment available to Puerto Rican women in New York City. By union contract[3] skirt and sportswear workers were assured of minimum rates of pay for a 35-hour week shown in Table VIII-b.

With constantly expanding skirt production, seasons have been long, without the lengthy slack period common to the garment trades, and there have been opportunities for overtime work. Workers could therefore expect to earn a fair livelihood in the skirt industry. Moreover since operators, the most numerous craft, work according to piece rates, they have been able to look forward to larger earnings through increased proficiency. Not only are wage rates in the skirt industry good but they compare favorably with those in other sections of the garment industry, except in the high-paid coat and suit trade. Many of the women workers, moreover, are only supplementary wage-earners.

---

[1] There are about 1500 Negroes in the industry, about 100 of whom are cutters and pressers. Why more Negroes have not entered the industry has not been determined but it is not due to discrimination, since some some employers prefer them to Latin Americans (see interviews with employers, p. 258). It may well have been that with full employment, wages in the garment industry at the lower levels were not particularly attractive to Negroes.

[2] John H. Burma, Spanish-Speaking Groups in the United States, Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 1954, p. 177.

[3] Agreement, National Skirt and Sportswear Association, Inc. with the ILGWU Board of Cloak Suit Skirt and Reefer Makers' Union, 1953-1958, pp. 13, 14.

Table VIII-b. Minimum Wages of Skirt and Sportswear Workers

	Minimum Pay
Week Workers (weekly):	
Markers	$81.00
Cutters	74.00
Special machine operators (quality group)	49.00
Special machine operators (low-end group)	43.00
Hand finishers (quality group)	45.00
Hand finishers (low-end group)	40.00
Cleaners (quality group)	36.00
Cleaners (low-end group)	32.50
Piece Workers (hourly):	
Pressers	$2.08
Operators (quality group)	1.60
Operators (low-end group)	1.45

Skirtmakers also enjoy a variety of fringe benefits. These include a weekly sick benefit of from $20 to $35, depending upon earnings, for up to twenty weeks in a year; $10 a day hospitalization for up to sixty days; $100 surgical benefit; $300 tuberculosis benefit; $5 toward the purchase of eyeglasses every two years; and an annual welfare benefit, designed to defray the expense of a vacation, of $50 for operators and $36 for special machine operators, finishers, cleaners, and floor workers. Pensions of $50 a month are available at age 65 to those who have worked in the industry for twenty out of the twenty-five years before retirement.

In addition to jobs, wages, and benefits, the lightness of the materials worked on and the skills and training required have also played their part in drawing Latin Americans, mainly Puerto Ricans, into the skirt industry. It is easier to work on the lighter materials -- silk, cotton, rayon, and so forth -- of which skirts, dresses, and undergarments are made. Since most of the Puerto Rican workers are females, many of them of light build, the ease of working on rayon skirts has been an attraction. Even more important is the element of skill involved. Most women already have some knowledge of sewing and the use of sewing machines from making and repairing family garments at home.

Moreover the making of a skirt is a fairly simple operation, for it consists basically of joining three seams together and then adding gores, belts and loops, and pockets.

The cheaper the garment, the simpler its manufacture. (Its simplicity and the small amount of labor involved are, in fact, what permit it to be so inexpensive.) The production is further broken down on a section work basis, whereby each operator performs an elementary task, such as joining a seam. An unskilled worker can learn such an operation rapidly, and as a result the Puerto Ricans, Cubans, and other Latin Americans have found it easy to enter the industry, particularly in the low-price line where they are concentrated.

Besides operating, special machine operating, and cleaning, the other crafts involved in the production of a skirt are cutting and pressing. The last two have always been jobs for men, and a few Puerto Rican men have begun entering the industry as pressers and even cutters, though in much smaller numbers than the Puerto Rican women who have entered the other crafts.

II. PUERTO RICANS IN THE SKIRT INDUSTRY

Labor Force

There are today about 9000 workers in New York City's skirt shops, 1000 of whom are in those shops which are attached to the coat and suit industry and the other 8000 in the separate skirt and sportswear trade.

The skirt and sportswear industry is well organized and has been so for many decades. Four locals of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union have jurisdiction in it. They are Local 23, Skirtmakers; Local 10, Cutters; Local 35, Cloak and Suit Pressers; and Local 48, Italian Cloakmakers.

The most important of these is Local 23, the Skirtmakers' Union, which covers all production workers (operators, special machine operators, cleaners, and so forth) except cutters and pressers. Almost all the Puerto Ricans and other Latin Americans come under the jurisdiction of Local 23. That local's membership, as of January 1, 1957, was 8036, of whom about half were Latin Americans, almost entirely women. Of the 500 pressers in the skirt and sportswear industry 422 are members of Local 35, Cloak and Suit Pressers, and the rest are in Local 48, Italian Cloakmakers. Of the 422 Local 35 pressers 60 to 85, all men, are Latin Americans. The other 462 workers in the industry are cutters, the most highly skilled craft. There are fewer Puerto Ricans in this group -- an estimated 20 to 30 men. Of these a few are skilled cutters, while the others are mostly stretchers and other types of apprentices.

Since cutters and pressers are men, generally with family responsibilities, who enjoy high wage rates, there is little turnover. This is not as true in the case of the Local 23 crafts, which involve a majority of women. Local 23's membership as of January 1, 1956, had been 7787, and had climbed to 8036 by January 1, 1957, a net gain of 249 in the year. During the year, however, it had actually taken in 900 new members and dropped 651 old ones. The dropped membership as a percentage of the January 1, 1956 membership is 8.4, a low quit figure as compared to women workers generally in the apparel trades. Although Latin Americans comprise about half the local's membership, they account for most of the quits, but even considering this, their turnover rate in the industry (though they undoubtedly do shift more from shop to shop) is still low. A recent study of the U.S. Department of Labor indicated that women's quit rates in all industry have been more closely approaching those of men in recent years.[4]

The major reasons for dropping out of the union and the industry are those commonly associated with female workers -- marriage, pregnancy, and home responsibilities. Transfers to other locals, because they find better jobs in shops of closely allied garment trades, and returns to Puerto Rico, Cuba, and other countries of origin account for the other quits.

While the local feels that its greatest turnover is with Puerto Rican workers, it is difficult to measure this accurately. First of all, no records indicate ethnic background of members. Second, when a worker from most other groups leaves the trade for a temporary period, she takes a withdrawal card from the union, which permits her to return without paying a new initiation fee.[5] In the case of the Puerto Rican workers, only a minority take advantage of this procedure. Most of them simply let their membership lapse and then come back as new members. The most obvious explanation of this is a financial one: In order to obtain a withdrawal card, one must be paid up in dues, so that many Puerto Ricans just stop paying dues a number of months before leaving the trade, preferring the immediate cash saving to the possible saving of the initiation fee later on. The local knows that many of the women who go gack to Puerto Rico for a while, or who drop out because they are pregnant, do later return to the trade as new members, but without the withdrawal card procedure it cannot have precise information on the number.

---

[4] "Labor Turnover of Women Factory Workers, 1950-1955," Monthly Labor Review, Aug. 1955, pp. 839-894.

[5] Initiation fees are $55 for operators, $40 for special machine operators, and $30 for cleaners. For a new shop, fees are reduced to $45, $35, and $27 respectively.

Earnings

The Puerto Rican workers, being the most recent entrants into the trade and hence the least skilled, are concentrated in the cheaper end of the industry's production, but a fair number have moved into the medium-price line shops, and a few into the high-price line shops. Three different wage scales exist for the skirtmakers -- the highest in contracting shops working for suit jobbers and coming under the collective agreements of the coat and suit industry; the other two wage scales are those covered by the collective agreements in the skirt and sportswear industry, one being for workers in the quality (higher price line) shops and the other for those in the popular (low-end) price line shops.

Examination by the writer of the payrolls of six popular-price line shops in the third week of July 1956, which was during but not at the height of the season, disclosed the average earnings shown in Table VIII-c.

Table VIII-c. Average Earnings, Third Week of July 1956

Craft	No. Workers	Average Earnings
Operators	137	$67.77
Special machine operators	27	51.85
Cutters	16	116.09
Pressers	15	144.74
Cleaners and other floor help	13	43.86
Total	208	$73.48

Since operators work according to piece rates, their earnings are dependent upon their own skill, and so there should be no variation according to ethnic groups. This was borne out by the survey, which disclosed that both the operator with the highest earnings and the one with the lowest during that week were women who had Spanish names. In the case of the other categories of Local 23 membership, special machine operators and cleaners and other floor workers, who work according to time rates, there also appeared to be no variation between the earnings of workers with Spanish-sounding surnames and others. With the floor workers, for instance, the high of $50.50 and the low of $35 were both earned by women with Spanish names. Among the pressers there seemed to be a variation within one shop, in which the low for the week went to a Spanish-named man, evidently an apprentice. The variation would be accounted for by the fact that the other workers had been in the trade longest, and thus were the most skilled, whereas the Latin American, as the newest entrant, must first learn the trade.

The earnings of piece workers are dependent not only upon their own skill but also upon the volume of work available to them. Since skirt production is seasonal, earnings vary from week to week. Table VIII-d shows the average earnings for the same six shops in a less busy week, the first week in June 1956.

Table VIII-d. Average Earnings, First Week of June 1956

Craft	No. Workers	Average Earnings
Operators	131	$49.78
Special machine operators	26	50.04
Cutters	13	116.49
Pressers	15	116.81
Cleaners and other floor help	13	42.54
Total	198	$58.80

There was only chance variation in the average earnings between the two weeks of the crafts which are paid on a time basis: special machine operators, $51.85 and $50.04; cutters, $116.09 and $116.49; and floor workers, $43.86 and $42.54. The two piece-rate crafts, however, reflect the variation in the volume of work: Operators' average earnings were $17.99 lower (26.5 percent) in the first week of June than the third week of July; and pressers averaged $27.93 (19.3 percent) less between the same two weeks. (Unfortunately, figures for annual earnings were not available.)

Prejudice and Discrimination against Latin Americans

The shortage of labor has been a major factor in preventing discrimination against Puerto Ricans in employment, even from those who might be prejudiced against them. While they make up a smaller percentage of the workers in the top crafts of cutting and pressing than in the Local 23 crafts, it must be remembered that the former have a reservoir of young American-born men in their ranks and, not being troubled by any shortage of labor, have not needed many new workers.

The presence of Puerto Rican workers in these two crafts also discloses that the locals involved have no policy of barring them. For although it is true that under the union shop agreement in the industry employers may hire whomever they want, in the case of these two crafts they almost invariably depend upon the unions to supply them with competent workers.

An interview with one cutter illustrates this process. This worker, who had been a cutter in Puerto Rico, had come to the mainland in order to earn a better living. He found his first job through a newspaper advertisement and in 1949, after some time in the industry, he made direct application to Local 10 and was admitted into membership. His wages today are $100 a week, exclusive of overtime, which is 35 percent above the minimum scale. In addition, he enjoys year-round work, having been laid off for only two weeks in the past decade.

Visits to various skirt shops disclosed that opinions regarding Puerto Ricans and Cuban workers vary considerably among manufacturers. Thus two interviews offer diametrically opposed views:

Firm A, operating an inside shop in the popular price line, employs 70 to 75 workers, 80 percent of whom are either Puerto Rican or Cuban. The employer reported that they worked as operators, special machine operators, cleaners, and other types of floor help. He is not at all satisfied with them. Although he reports no troubles in his relationship with Puerto Ricans and has a Puerto Rican forelady, he regards them as too clannish, sloppy in their workmanship, and generally undependable, having too high a rate of absenteeism and turnover. He started hiring them and continues to do so simply because there is no other help available. He generally recruits new employees by placing advertisements in Spanish language newspapers. He has tried to get American-born workers, particularly Negro girls, but can't find enough of them. Besides placing more reliance on other workers, he finds them easier to talk to, and frankly admitted that if other types of workers were available, he would not continue to hire Puerto Ricans.

Firm B, also operating an inside shop in the popular price line, employs about 350 workers, over 90 percent of whom are Puerto Rican or Cuban. The employer reported that they worked as cutters, operators, special machine operators, cleaners, and other types of floor help. He also started hiring Puerto Ricans in large numbers because other workers were not available, but this was not his first experience with Puerto

Rican workers; he had had a few as far back as twenty-eight years ago. He was completely satisfied with their work, and when in need of additional workers, he depends upon those who work for him to bring in their friends. His volume of business has permitted him to provide year-round work for his employees, and he stated that he has almost no problem of turnover, for people just don't leave his shop if they can help it. He further reported that his relationship with his Puerto Rican workers was very good and on the same basis as with any other kind of worker that he has ever employed. He stated that he would continue to hire Puerto Ricans even if other types of workers were available.

It is difficult from interviews and cursory observations of the two shops to pin down the reasons for these differences in attitude. The employer in Firm B, like many others in the skirt industry, was a Sephardic, Spanish-speaking Jew, and although he denied that his ability to speak Spanish had any bearing on his relationship with his workers, my observations indicated otherwise. The employer's ability to converse directly with his workers establishes a personal relationship which helps to build loyalty to the firm. The opinions of union officials substantiate this observation. The employer in Firm A, on the other hand, knew no Spanish, and although he hired a Puerto Rican forelady, he complained that it was difficult to communicate with his workers. Firm B by providing steadier employment was apparently able to attract a better grade of worker who was less inclined to leave for another job, simply because there were few better jobs available.

The method of recruitment may also be important. Firm A, by using newspaper advertisements, is probably getting marginal, less experienced workers and newer arrivals unaccustomed to factory work discipline. Firm B, by depending upon personal contacts of its present employees, is probably getting better workers who are more acculturated to the environment of the factory and of New York.

It is significant that neither employer could recall ethnic group conflicts, such as disputes concerning the proper division of work, among his workers. Will Herberg, in his study of ethnic group relations in the dress industry,[6] on the other hand, reported that the newcomers are made the objects of the stereotypes of "selfish," "lazy," "irresponsible," and "bad union people," by the oldtimers. His basis for this was the reports of business agents and examination of union grievance board cases.

---

[6] Will Herberg, "The Old-Timers and the Newcomers, Ethnic Group Relations in a Needle Trades Union," Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 9, Summer 1953.

That the relations between ethnic groups in the skirt shops are also far from perfect is a valid assumption. The interviews with the Latin American Local 23 executive board members (see below) disclose difficulties similar to those reported by Herberg. But relationships in the skirt industry are not so strained as to make union officials conscious of them as a problem, and an examination of the grievance cases in Local 23 fails to disclose any involving ethnic conflict. This was particularly surprising in an industry where workers often have disputes concerning the proper division of work; one might have expected these to erupt into jealousies and fights between different ethnic groups.

The absence of pronounced bad feeling between the skirt industry's older ethnic groups and the newcomers, and the lack of barriers to both vertical and horizontal shifts in jobs for Puerto Rican workers, may be ascribed in the main to the fact that the latter entered the industry at a time when it was expanding, which meant that they were not competing with the others for scarce jobs and scarce bundles.

The attitude of the union leadership has also been important. It has treated all workers in an equal manner, and has used its influence to attempt to integrate the Puerto Ricans into the local, as is evidenced in the following material.

III. LOCAL 23 PROGRAM FOR PUERTO RICAN INTEGRATION

Background of Local 23

Local 23, New York Skirtmakers, is one of the oldest sections of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, having been chartered in 1903.[7] From the beginning it has played an important role in the affairs of both the New York Cloak Joint Board, to which it is affiliated, and of the international union. In 1904 John Dyche, a member of Local 23, was elected secretary-treasurer of the ILGWU. The local was actively involved in the Cloakmakers' "Great Revolt" of 1910, a general strike which led to the establishment of the union as a force in the industry and marked the beginning of collective bargaining.

---

[7] Lewis L. Lorwin, The Women's Garment Workers, New York: B. W. Heubsch, 1924, p. 110.

The background of the local's membership and leadership was similar to that of the rest of the ILGWU. They were mainly Jewish immigrants from Eastern Europe, most of whom had fled Czarist autocracy. Their ideological outlook was generally socialist, and large segments of the membership and leadership read the Jewish Daily Forward and were affiliated with the Socialist Party and the Workmen's Circle, all of which were part of the labor-socialist movement of that time. The ideology of the union's founders stressed internationalism and the interests of the entire working class.

Growing Awareness of Presence of Puerto Ricans

With the expansion of the separate skirt industry in the middle 1940s, Puerto Ricans and other Latin American Spanish-speaking groups began to stream into the local. At the same time the number of Jewish members began to decline. The Jewish workers had been concentrated mainly in that section of skirt production which was part of the coat and suit industry, whereas the Latin Americans went mostly into the shops of the separate skirt and sportswear trade. Table VIII-e shows the great growth of Local 23's membership since 1940.

Table VIII-e. Membership of Local 23[a]

Year	Membership
1940	2,145
1942	2,707
1944	3,720
1946	4,649
1947	5,534
1950	5,974
1951	6,787
1952	7,449
1957	8,036

[a] Taken from the Official Census of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union for the particular years.

At first the changing membership presented no particular problem for the local. Because of the prior presence of a group of Spanish-speaking Sephardic Jews among its members it had one Spanish-speaking business agent who was able to communicate with the new members. Around 1947 and 1948, however, the local leadership began to be aware of the fact that the large-scale entrance of Latin Americans, chiefly Puerto Ricans, into its ranks posed special problems both of communication and of union-consciousness. The oldtimers had either been part of the general labor-socialist movement or had learned the value of trade unionism from first-hand experience. The newcomers, however, were mainly women who had not worked in their country of origin and thus lacked awareness of what trade unionism actually was. In addition, peaceful labor-management relations had been so well established in the industry that they had no first-hand experience of picket lines and other fights against the "bosses."

The local's awareness of this problem was intensified when it underwent a National Labor Relations Board election for a union shop in October 1948. Although it won that election by an overwhelming majority (4395 "for" and 36 "against"), it recognized that the changing ethnic composition of the local necessitated the formulation of a program to bind the newcomers to the union.

Program to Facilitate Latin American Integration

In the interest of strengthening the bonds between the membership and the union Local 23 determined to integrate the Puerto Rican workers into its ranks. Its approach was interesting -- it did not put the newcomers on a separate footing, but treated them the same way it treated all other members; and it addressed its message to the new Negro and Puerto Rican members, not as Negroes and Puerto Ricans, but simply as workers. Nevertheless, recognizing the special problem of language difficulties it added over the years four Spanish-speaking business agents to its staff, all Sephardic Jews from the trade. In October 1949 the position of educational director was created and a person fluent in Spanish appointed. For a time the local also had a Spanish-speaking clerk in its sick benefit department.

Having acquired an educational director the local set up a special education program, not with the specific end of integration in mind, but rather designed to strengthen the ties of all its members with the union. A major feature of the program was the inauguration in 1950 of classes in English for Hispanics. These classes have been run every year since then, and a few hundred workers have taken advantage of them. The classes in English are viewed by the local as an opportunity not only to teach English but also to provide familiarity with American customs and to stress good citizenship and good union membership. The students are afforded an opportunity for self-expression. Emphasis is placed upon conversation rather than perfect grammar, so that students may be able to function as members of the union and the community.

The classes provide an avenue to advancement as well, for such knowledge is important for rising to better-paying jobs, even within the industry. One may well be able to come into the industry without knowing English -- for in a low-end price-line shop the union chairman, the forelady, and most of the rest of the workers are likely to speak Spanish-- but to break into a better price-line shop, where few speak Spanish, often requires a fairly good command of English. The local has found that the members who attend class can later be recruited more easily into union activities, particularly along political action lines.

A class usually starts off with 50 students, but it soon runs into the problem of attendance. This is to be expected; classes are noncompulsory and free, and since the industry is seasonal, workers do not bother to come downtown to union headquarters during the slack period. In a poll by the educational director of those who had dropped out of the course one year, the major reasons offered were: family responsibilities (many of the workers are wives and mothers); dates (many of the rest are single young girls); switching to schools in the neighborhood to continue the study of English; and sickness.

A second part of the union's program is its annual spring dance. This is regarded as an institution through which to weld the membership into one solid group.[8] It is the local's most popular activity as far as the Latin American members are concerned, and the one union event which a majority of them attend. Since most of the oldtimers are past the dancing age, the Latin Americans, who are mostly young, make up the great majority of the 5000 who attend. The local attempts to widen its appeal to them by offering valuable door prizes, and by including a Latin American band in addition to a regular dance orchestra.

A third aspect of the local's program, which was started in 1952, is its annual shop chairmen's week-end outing to Unity House, the ILGWU vacation resort in the Pocono Mountains. Since about one-third of the chairmen and chairladies are Puerto Ricans or other

---

[8] Report of Louis Reiss, manager of Local 23, to union meeting, May 27, 1954.

Latin Americans this helps to cement the ties between them and the other ethnic groups among the membership.

Local 23 also runs a counseling service, in the person of its educational director, to aid members with personal problems. The Puerto Ricans take advantage of this service, and the types of problems handled are those generally associated with low incomes and lack of familiarity with American institutions. The most important is one that is common to all sections of the seasonal garment industry -- unemployment insurance. This is a particular problem to Puerto Ricans, who are often unfamiliar with the workings of the law and are still somewhat ill at ease with state agencies. Another problem is garnishees of wages because of defaults in credit payments, which are often associated with low-income groups who have not developed regular saving habits. Then there are the typical problems with landlords -- overcharges in rents, violations of rent control procedures, refusal to repair apartments, and such. There are in addition a variety of personal problems, typical of which would be finding day-care centers for the children of working mothers.

The union's counseling service acts mainly as a referral to the social and governmental agencies that handle such problems, but where the union can solve a problem directly, either through a telephone call or a letter, it does so.

Other educational activities of Local 23 include lectures on topics of the day, visits to places of historic and current importance (such as the headquarters of the United Nations), and a library with books in Spanish and English. The local also issued a booklet, "What Every Local 23 Member Should Know," in English, Spanish, and Yiddish, which gave a comprehensive picture of benefits available from government and the union.[9]

Political education is a part of the program. Members are urged to register and to vote. Special assistance was provided to members in preparing forms for permanent personal registration. Attempts are made to keep the membership apprised of the importance of special legislation in which the labor movement is interested. Drives to obtain signatures on petitions to the state legislature and the Congress concerning legislation dealing with matters such as unemployment insurance and civil rights have been conducted in the skirt shops.

---

[9] Report and Record, Twenty-eighth Convention, ILGWU, 1953, p. 87.

Members are kept abreast of union activities through the regular receipt of Justice, the official ILGWU bi-monthly publication. They may elect to receive it in English, or in Spanish, Italian, or Yiddish. Suprisingly enough, the vast majority of Puerto Ricans chooses the English edition, possible because of a reluctance to admit to not speaking the language. The local nevertheless displays at its headquarters extra copies of the Spanish edition which members may pick up free at any time. The local has also been contemplating the publication of its own newspaper, in both English and Spanish, in a further attempt to communicate with the membership.

Perhaps the most significant aspect of the local's program is the long-run attempt to develop a core of Latin American leadership. It has sought out prospective leaders and tried to induce them to take an active part in union affairs. It has made a good start in that direction, for one-third of the shop chairmen and five members of the local's executive board are Latin Americans.

IV. RESPONSE TO THE LOCAL 23 PROGRAM

The Mass Response

Although, like all workers in all unions, only a small minority of Puerto Ricans has taken advantage of the many educational activities available, the Puerto Rican response to the Local 23 program has been a fairly good one from the union's point of view. Contact has been established with them, they have not become a source of discord within the ranks, and there has been no manifestation of Latin American dissatisfaction. Their union activity doesn't measure up to the response of the oldtimers, but any attempt to draw a comparison between the interest and participation in union affairs of Puerto Ricans today with that of the Jewish immigrants forty and fifty years ago would be misleading, for the times have changed. For Puerto Ricans, as for most immigrant groups, all aspects of industrial life, but particularly trade unionism, are new experiences. The Welsh, Scottish, and Jewish groups, who brought unionism with them from overseas, are the exceptions.[10]

At the time when the Jews in the industry came to America around the turn of the century the union was a "movement," whereas today it is an "institution." In the movement phase, when the union was first being built, the voluntary participation of the membership was essential for its success. Once the union became solidly established, with the employers neither desiring nor being in a position to dislodge it, and with its own structure somewhat bureaucratized (meaning that it was governed to a large extent by a multiplicity of detailed rules[11]) membership participation was still welcome and beneficial, but not vital to the continued successful functioning of the organization.

---

[10] Leonard R. Sayles and George Strauss, The Local Union, New York: Harper, 1953, p. 217.

Moreover, since the Puerto Rican members are overwhelmingly women, who are usually less active participants in organizational affairs than men, they could not be expected to exhibit the same interest as the oldtimers, most of whom had been men. As compared to women of other ethnic backgrounds (except for the earlier Jewish immigrants who were devoted to the union movement[12]) they are not appreciably less active.

Like all voluntary associations today Local 23 is faced with the problem of effecting widespread membership participation in its activities. Starting in 1957 the local, in view of the record of poor attendance at membership meetings, decided to reduce the number to four a year. There are many reasons for the poor attendance. Besides personal responsibilities to home and family, there are sufficient diversions in our society to keep members away from meetings. In addition, since conditions in the industry have been very good for the past number of years, the membership has had few complaints to voice, and has found no compelling reasons to attend meetings. The Puerto Ricans definitely contribute to this poor attendance record.

Monthly membership dues are $4 for operators and $3.50 for all other crafts, and the Latin Americans as a group are less prompt to pay up than their fellow members. The Puerto Rican women often fall behind many months in their payments, but this does not trouble the local too much, because everyone rushes to pay up her book in the spring in order to qualify for the industry's annual "vacation" benefit distributed by the Skirt and Sportswear Health and Welfare Fund in June. For those who fall too far behind in their payments there are complications.

---

[11] Wilbert E. Moore, "Management and Union Organizations: An Analytical Comparison," in Arensberg, Barkin, et. al., Research in Industrial Human Relations, New York: Harper, 1957, p. 122.

[12] Theresa Wolfson, The Women Worker and the Trade Unions, New York: International Publishers, 1926, p. 212.

According to the ILGWU constitution a member who is three months in arrears shall not be considered in good standing, but the local does not enforce this provision too strictly. After nine months of failure to pay dues a member is supposed to stand automatically expelled unless his local union accepts full payment before he is in arrears for twelve months.[13] Often the local finds itself pleading with the office of the international for special exceptions in the cases of some of its members because of their newness to trade unionism.

The Latin Americans have responded well to appeals for voluntary contributions to finance labor political action. The Skirtmakers 1956 Campaign Committee collected an average of $1.25 per member.

The Secondary Leadership Core

A significant difference between today's Puerto Rican migration and that of the oldtimers is that the Jews enjoyed a leadership that the Puerto Rican community in New York has lacked.[14] In part this is due to the fact that Puerto Ricans who become well-integrated into the greater society generally leave the Puerto Rican community.[15] The Local 23 experience in its attempts to develop leadership from among its Latin American members has been revealing.

Local 23 has no full-time paid official who is Latin American. The Latin Americans have, with the encouragement of the union's officers, however, entered the ranks of secondary leadership in the union. As has been pointed out, in about one-third of the shops in the skirt industry, a Puerto Rican or other Latin American worker is shop chairman (or chairlady). These are elected by the workers in the shop, but not all shop chairmen have run for office spontaneously. Often there is no candidate for the post, and the union business agent must seek out the worker with apparent leadership qualities and induce him to take the job. Once having served as chairman the worker usually begins to like the post despite all the problems it may entail.

---

[13] Constitution and By-Laws of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, Article 8, Section 12 (a).

[14] Speech of Charles Abrams to the 1955 meeting of the Labor Advisory Committee on Puerto Rican Affairs.

[15] Mills, Senior, and Goldsen, The Puerto Rican Journey, New York: Harper, 1950, p. 106.

The shop chairman is the members' prime contact with the union, particularly since so few attend membership meetings. The chairmen are relied upon by the union to assist the business agent in keeping the workers in the shops informed of all union policies, in seeing to it that proper piece rates are being paid to all workers and that all other union standards are maintained, and in assisting the collection of all special taxes and voluntary contributions to finance labor political activity.

The local's executive board of 25 rank-and-file members contains five Latin Americans: 1 from South America, 1 from Cuba, 1 from Mexico, and 2 from Puerto Rico. There are also 3 Negroes, 2 Italians, 1 recent European immigrant, and 3 Spanish Jews on the executive board, while the other 11 are from the older Eastern European Jewish immigration.

Of the Latin American board members the only man was first elected in 1950, and the 4 women were first elected in 1953. All have subsequently been reelected. They had all been chairmen of their shops and had been active in union affairs. The local leadership had observed their activities and suggested that they run for office. Being picked for nomination by the incumbent administration is tantamount to election, since only a minute Communist group ever offers any organized opposition. In the 1956 election all who were nominated were elected by acclamation.

That there are not more Latin American members on the executive board is not a sign of discrimination, but of the fact that all members are virtually automatically returned to office, and new openings become available only as oldtimers retire or die. When new openings have become available the local leadership has sought to find Latin Americans to nominate for the board.

Each member of the executive board must serve on subordinate committees, and the assignments of the Latin Americans disclose them to be among the most active board members:

Membership -- The chairman of this committee is a woman who comes from South America. A Cuban woman also serves on the committee, bringing the Latin American proportion to 2 out of 6. This committee would be expected to have Latin American membership, since it reviews all applications for membership in the local.

Grievance -- This committee includes a Puerto Rican woman and a Mexican man among its 6 members. It handles all intra-union complaints, and charges by one member against another.

Appeals -- There is 1 Puerto Rican woman member out of a total of 7. It hears appeals from decisions of the grievance committee. (Beyond the appeals committee, a member may carry appeals all the way up the ladder in the following order: Local 23 executive board; general manager of the Cloak Joint Board; president of the ILGWU; and the convention of the ILGWU. No appeal has actually ever been carried further than the general manager of the Cloak Joint Board.)

Education -- Out of the 4 members of this committee, 2 are Latin Americans. This committee works closely with the local's educational director, and the fact that half its members are Latin Americans indicates that its program is aimed primarily at the members of this ethnic group.

A perusal of the minutes of the executive board shows that the 5 Latin American members are quite active in local affairs in other ways. They serve as local delegates to many other labor bodies, including the Cloak Joint Board, the Women's Trade Union League (now defunct), the Negro Labor Committee, the Labor Advisory Committee on Puerto Rican Affairs, and the Spanish Division of the Liberal Party. They have also served on special delegations to Albany or Washington to contact legislators concerning proposed and pending legislation. The Latin American members have also been utilized in helping to organize nonunion shops in which Spanish-speaking workers predominated. In 1954, for instance, 3 of them went to work in such a shop, and then agitated for the ILGWU among the other workers.

One active Puerto Rican member of Local 23 has also started up the leadership ladder through attendance at the ILGWU Training Institute, the graduates of which become full-time union officials. She had been chairlady of her shop and had served as a member of the local's elections and objections committee. When she entered the Training Institute in 1954 the local awarded her a $500 scholarship. It maintained interest in her work, and reports on her progress were made periodically to the executive board. She was invited to address a board meeting, which she informed of her experiences in organizing garment workers in other parts of the nation. Graduates of the Institute become union organizers, but since Local 23 has no organizers of its own, depending instead upon the Cloak Joint Board for this phase of its activities, she did not return to Local 23, but became an organizer for another ILGWU local in New York City.

Interviews with Latin American Executive Board Members

The successful integration of Puerto Ricans and other Latin Americans into the skirt union cannot be carried on solely by the top leadership of Local 23, but must depend in large measure upon the leadership they are able to develop from among the workers. Because of this, special attention in the course of this study was given to the Latin American members of the executive board, and interviews were conducted with all of them. A summary of the results follows.[16]

R. H. He is the male member of the quintet, who, though born in Cuba, grew up in Mexico. He is married but has no children, and has lived in the United States for thirty years. He had been a tailor in Mexico and had come to New York in order to seek opportunity to earn a better living. He had learned some English in school in Mexico, but when he arrived here he continued his study of the language at night school.

When R. H. arrived here he found his first job in the dress industry, but two years later friends in the skirt industry helped him to find a job in that trade. Today he is a samplemaker, a highly skilled operator, in a contracting shop that produces medium-price skirts. He plans to remain in the industry until retirement. He could recall no incident of discrimination against him in the industry, but has witnessed arguments among different ethnic groups in shops. Since he has been chairman for many years, he has always stopped such difficulties in his shop before they amounted to anything. He has found that the workers, regardless of their ethnic background, will listen to him, and believes that the Latin American workers who have come into the trade in recent years are treated "O.K.."

R. H. joined the union in 1933, when he was caught up in the general pro-union sentiment of the early N. R. A. Local 23 was then rebuilding, following its decline because of the internal warfare of the late 1920s and depression of the early 1930s. He had always felt pro-union and so soon became chairman of his shop and an active member of Local 23. He would like to become a full-time union official but questions his own preparation for such work. He does not believe that there are any group conflicts within the union, feels that Latin American workers are treated on the same basis as other members, and that the union is doing a good job for the membership.

R. H. lives in Manhattan, in a neighborhood not predominantly Latin American, in which group relations are good. He believes that being a union member helps him with problems in the neighborhood because it gives him a sense of security, a feeling that he would have a helping hand in case of trouble with his landlord, etc. He is not active in any neighborhood or other organizations outside the union. Within the union he regards himself as a spokesman for the Spanish-speaking members, in the sense that he provides a channel of liaison between them and the union.

---

[16] R. H. is in his early fifties. The four women are in their early forties.

R. V. This very articulate member of the executive board was born in South America, but grew up in New York City, where she was graduated from high school. She is married and is the mother of two grown children. She too started her working life in the dress industry, but found the work tiring. When her first employer switched to the skirt trade in 1941 she went to work for him and has remained a skirtmaker since then. She is an operator in a contracting shop which produces high-priced skirts, and plans to remain in the industry. Although she had encountered prejudice against her because she was Latin American, she felt that it had never been serious and that in time and through contact it had always been dispelled. She believes that there were some group conflicts in the shops and hostility expressed toward Latin Americans by the other workers when the Puerto Ricans began entering after the war, but feels that this unfriendliness is disappearing with time. In her own shop the workers give the silent treatment to anyone who displays prejudice.

By the time she entered the garment industry in 1939 it was already well organized, and she joined the union simply because she worked in a union shop. When she switched to the skirt industry she merely transferred her ILGWU membership from Local 22 to Local 23. Her interest in the union was kindled by a Local 23 business agent who convinced her of the importance of attending union meetings. Her attendance in turn generated greater interest up to the point where she was induced to run for the executive board. She would like to become a full-time official, but being a rather outspoken person, doubts her ability to act with the tact and diplomacy required. She has observed some group conflicts within the union, whereby workers of one ethnic group felt that another was being favored in placement for jobs, but she considered these to have been merely manifestations of petty jealousies.

R. V. does not consider herself a spokesman for the Latin American members within the union. Her South American origin plus her having been brought up in New York have undoubtedly led her to consider the Puerto Ricans and Cubans as "they" and herself as part of the "we" that comprise the rest of the membership. This was evident from the fact that she blamed members for personal problems that may develop between them and the union; according to her, the fact that new members don't know how to approach union officials becomes a source of conflict. She too feels that the union is doing a good job, but sees language difficulties as a barrier to proper integration of the Puerto Ricans. She could offer no concrete suggestions for further union steps to overcome this problem except to report that as chairlady in her shop she splits up Spanish-speaking workers so that they must sit among others, and thus are forced to use English.

R. V. lives in a suburban residential community and is not active in any organizations outside the union, and so has no contact with Latin Americans in her private life.

C. C. A married woman without children she was born in Cuba, where she started university training toward becoming a physician. Not being able to afford to continue her studies she became a midwife. She came to the United States in 1937, returned to Cuba, came again in 1938, but once more returned to Cuba, and then in 1943 came to settle here permanently. She came here because she wanted to be a professional worker, but since midwives are not used here she went to work in a pocketbook shop.

In 1945 she entered the skirt industry because she felt that there were greater earning opportunities there. She got her first job in her local neighborhood. Today she is an operator in a contracting shop producing low-priced skirts, though she had worked previously in a quality-line shop. She plans to remain in the industry.

C. C. had encountered some prejudice from other workers in the industry, but she blames it upon language difficulties and petty jealousies. She has seen some group conflicts in shops, including those between Puerto Rican and Cuban workers, but felt that they had not been too serious. Where there is trouble it concerns division of work in the slow seasons. In her own shop she uses her position as chairlady to nip any conflicts in the bud. She believes that Latin Americans are treated equally with others.

C. C. joined Local 23 by helping to organize the first skirt shop in which she worked. She had belonged to the Pocketbook Workers' Union, and so saw the need for a union in the skirt shop. During the organizing strike she sought out the ILGWU, and with its help, after eight weeks on the picket lines, the shop was signed.

Although she had studied English in Cuba, she improved her command of the language by attending Local 23's classes and others, including courses on trade unionism at the Rand School. A good deal of her motivation for becoming active in the union has stemmed from the social consciousness imparted to her by her husband, who, although not a worker in the trade or a member of the union, has accompanied her to all union meetings. She had served as a member of the price settlement committee in her shop, and when the chairlady left, her shopmates chose her for the job. As she took greater part in union affairs she expressed her interest to union officials, who paved the way for her to run for the executive board. She would like to become a full-time union official and has taken the ILGWU Officers' Qualification Course, which is a prerequisite for running for full-time office. Her only expressed hesitation regarded the fact that she was slightly hard of hearing.

C. C. does not feel that there are any group conflicts in the union, and believes that all members are treated alike, except that language difficulties often handicap Latin Americans in that there is a tendency to pay less attention to the shop problems of a member who finds difficulty in expressing herself. She is quite satisfied with the job that the union is doing for its members. She does not regard herself as a spokesman for the Latin American workers specifically.

She lives in the core area of Spanish Harlem, which is mostly Puerto Rican. While she knows of no group conflicts in her neighborhood, she admits that she remains aloof from neighborhood life. She has become active in the Council of Spanish American Organizations, however, playing a leading role in the annual Spanish Parade, which is an attempt to copy the type of parade that New York's Irish community holds on St. Patrick's Day. She also works with Jovenes de Mañana, the council's youth group, in setting up baseball teams and other activities designed to prevent juvenile delinquency. She regards such work as somewhat of a substitute for not having children of her own.

A. A. A married woman with one child, she was born in Puerto Rico. She came here on her own in order to go to high school, but had to quit school before graduation to return to Puerto Rico and care for her sick father. When he died in 1939 she came to New York permanently. She learned English in her schooling in Puerto Rico and New York. She married here and her daughter now attends one of the city colleges.

Her first job was as a bookkeeper in a blouse factory. Later she took a job in another blouse shop in her neighborhood, where she first learned to sew. Although the transition from office work was difficult for her, she had decided upon this course of action because office jobs were not too plentiful at that time, at least not for Puerto Ricans. Today she is an operator in an inside shop producing medium-price skirts. She plans to remain in the industry.

A. A. admitted encountering discrimination in the industry because of resentment against Puerto Ricans on the part of other workers. She knew of group conflicts in shops and felt that, in the interest of avoiding continual bickering, it was easier to work in a shop in which the Spanish-speaking workers were a majority. In general, however, she felt that Latin American workers were treated decently in the industry.

She had become a member of Local 25 of the ILGWU while working in the blouse industry, and when she switched to a skirt shop in 1949 she helped to organize that shop and thus became a member of Local 23. The same business agent who had "discovered" R. V. encouraged A. A. to become active in the union. Meanwhile she had developed a growing labor-consciousness as a result of her union experience. She was further impressed by the local's continual urging of Puerto Rican members to play a role in union affairs. She has no desire to become a full-time official. She has never encountered any discrimination within the union, and believes that Latin Americans are well treated, except that, since they are mainly women who have had almost no previous work experience, they require greater understanding and patience. She feels that the union is doing a good job for its members, but that there is a need for more educational activities, particularly trips to historic places, not only for their educational value but also because they provide an opportunity for social intercourse between Puerto Ricans and other members. While she regards herself as a spokesman for the Spanish-speaking members, she considers this to be a two-way street, whereby she is also a spokesman for the union to them.

A. A. also lives in Spanish Harlem and feels that group relations in the neighborhood are good. She too is active in the Council of Spanish American Organizations, which is composed of 168 constituent societies. She is very active in its women's division and was, in fact, the first factory worker elected as its president, a post she now holds. Among other activities the group works closely with the Girl Scouts and the Riverside Health Center. In addition she is a member of the neighborhood Liberal Party club and takes part in activities concerned with rent control, and so forth. She believes that union support has been most important to her in her outside activities, and through the union she is now taking a course in community organization being offered by the Puerto Rican Labor Department.

A. C. She came from Puerto Rico to the United States in 1949 in order to be able to earn sufficient money to send her only daughter to college, which she has done. A. C. had had some college training in Puerto Rico, and had become a patternmaker in the garment industry.

When she arrived in New York friends took her into the skirt shop in which they worked, a shop which is considered very attractive because it provides year-round work at good wages. She still works in that same shop, which is an inside shop producing cheap skirts. She is an operator and shop chairlady today. Although she had learned English in Puerto Rico she took further schooling in it here. She plans to remain in the garment industry, but not necessarily the skirt section, for she is now going to school in order to become a designer.

Having worked in only the one shop A. C. has never encountered any discrimination or group conflicts in the industry. She has found Latin Americans to be treated well and believes that her employer provides them with "100 percent opportunity."

Since her shop was a union one when she went to work in it, she became a union member at that time. Her motivation for union activity was affiliation with a political party in Puerto Rico which was sympathetic with workers' movements. After joining the union she started going to meetings. Meanwhile she had become chairlady of her shop, and her shopmates soon suggested that she run for the executive board. This idea was encouraged by the union leadership, so she did. She would like to become a full-time official.

A. C. has never encountered any discrimination or group conflict in the union. She feels that Latin American members are treated well, and that the union is doing a good job for all its members. She does regard herself as a spokesman for the Spanish-speaking workers.

She lives just above what is considered Spanish Harlem, but her neighborhood is still heavily Puerto Rican. She feels that group relations in the neighborhood are good. She is too tired from her shop work and schooling to take an active role in organizations outside the union, except that at election time she does work with her neighborhood Democratic Party Club.

V. EVALUATION OF INTEGRATION

A Successful Start

The impression that emerges is one of a fairly successful beginning to the integration of Puerto Rican and other Latin American workers into the fabric of the New York skirt industry and Local 23, ILGWU.

The prime reason for their being made welcome was that the industry was expanding and they provided the major source of needed manpower, as a result of which there was no intense competition among different ethnic groups for jobs. Had they entered the industry during a period when jobs were not plentiful their integration would have been much more difficult, as was indicated by Will Herberg's study.

A further factor in the successful integration of Puerto Ricans, Cubans, and other Latin Americans into Local 23 has been the fact that they are only one of a number of minority groups composing its membership. Although the union maintains no record of a member's racial, national, or religious background, Table VIII-f gives rough estimates of the local's composition.

Table VIII-f. Ethnic Composition of Local 23 (estimated)

Group	Number	Percentage
Latin Americans	4,000	50.0
Negroes	1,400	17.5
Jews (eastern European background)	1,100	13.8
Sephardic Jews	600	7.5
Italians	500	6.2
Chinese	300	3.8
Others	100	1.2
Total	8,000	100.0

The mere fact that Local 23 has been concerned with integrating its Puerto Rican members is in itself a positive step, and a reflection of the social philosophy of the ILGWU leadership. Although there is little formal socialism left, the concept of the equality and brotherhood of all workers remains an influence.

The role of the union has been formally acknowledged by the Spanish-speaking community. On April 16, 1956, the Council of Spanish American Organizations of Greater New York presented an "Award of Merit" to the Local 23 manager "in recognition of outstanding contributions in the field of human relations resulting in better understanding between the Spanish-speaking people of New York City and the total community."

The union's action in advancing integration has been in its own self-interest. Since the largest of the new ethnic groups entering the skirt industry in the past decade has been the Latin Americans, the leadership understood that it had to establish contact with this group if it were to be able to keep the industry well organized. Once Latin American workers were brought into the union's ranks their loyalty to the union had to be developed in order to keep peace and maintain the strength of the union. The union also wanted to make sure that they did not fall prey to any minority political groupings opposed to the present leadership. All these things have been accomplished.

Any idea that Local 23 has turned 4000 Latin American workers into active union firebrands, however, would be false. What has been accomplished is the beginning of the development of a core of secondary union leaders from among the Latin American workers.

This core is represented by the 5 Latin American members of the local's executive board and the more than 100 Latin American shop chairmen. This secondary leadership not only serves to bind the Latin American workers to the union but also to insure against any change of heart on the part of the present leadership that might reverse the process of integration. The shop chairman is the union's prime contact with its membership, particularly since most members do not attend meetings or read union literature. No union leadership, therefore, would be expected to stir up trouble with a group which supplied one-third of its shop chairmen and one-fifth of its executive board.

Not only does the existence of a core of Latin American secondary leadership serve to institutionalize the channels of integration in Local 23 but its continued development can be of great importance to the development of the Spanish-speaking community in New York City. By 1950, Oscar and Mary Handlin hold, the Puerto Ricans "had not yet developed their own leadership from out of a second generation; they were disposed, insofar as they acted politically at all, to follow the lead of outsiders more familiar with American ways than they."[17] "Furthermore, the occasional individual who was able to advance himself often found it advantageous to 'pass,' to break his ties with the group, and to lose his identification in the anonymity of urban life."[18] Those who advance to leadership within the union, however, are not as inclined to leave their community's ranks, and the interviews with executive board members show that, on the contrary, in some cases accession to union leadership positions has led to increased interest and activity in Latin American community life. As the union continues to develop this core of secondary leadership from among the Latin Americans it not only helps itself but also helps the Latin American community by training leaders for it.

---

[17] Oscar and Mary F. Handlin, "The United States," in The Positive Contribution by Immigrants, a symposium prepared for UNESCO by the International Sociological Association and the International Economic Association, Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 1955, p. 41.

[18] Ibid., p. 39.

Problems Remaining

The successful beginning to integration in Local 23 does not mean that all problems have been solved. Some of the integration may be only a surface phenomenon, and we have seen that some employers would discriminate against Puerto Ricans were there to be a surplus instead of a shortage of labor. Most of the Latin American workers also still have to advance up the scale to more skilled jobs, although a few have already done so. The interviews with the Latin American executive board members further indicated that ethnic conflicts do exist sub rosa among the workers, modified by job opportunities for all.

The situation within the union is far from perfect, too. Although the local's leadership has gone out of its way to make the Latin Americans welcome, a distance still separates the leadership and the newcomers. Even the union's efforts to integrate the Latin Americans suggests, to a degree, paternalism.

There is no one to blame for this state of affairs; having come to New York without leadership the Latin Americans have been dependent upon the oldtimers to take the lead for them; but this does create problems. In a local where Latin American workers comprise half the membership they have no representative among the full-time officials of the union. Much of this is due to the fact that those who founded and built the union remain in control. This is reinforced by the fact that the founding group was composed mainly of men, who are still the active members. Since the Latin Americans are predominantly women they are doubly handicapped in trying to get into full-time leadership.

Even the secondary leadership that is being developed was not thrown up by the Latin American members as their independent spokesmen, but was sought out by the local's administration, and this secondary leadership is itself just beginning to learn the rudiments of trade unionism. The entire problem of a leadership dating from a previous immigration, the members of which are a declining percentage of the local's membership, and a rank and file of another ethnic group is one of the most vexing for the union. The fact, however, that the union does seek potential leaders from among its Latin American members, some of whom then become interested in full-time union careers (as the interviews would suggest), offers promise that they will advance into primary levels within the coming years and contribute to a solution of the leadership problem.

Conclusions

Since Latin Americans are becoming an increasingly large segment of New York's industrial labor force the Local 23 experience in absorbing some 4000 of them can be important for all industry and labor. It is estimated that approximately 32,000 Puerto Ricans per year may migrate to New York City during the next three to five years.[19] As other ethnic groups which have historically been associated with clothing continue to decline in numbers within that industry, their places will be filled by Puerto Ricans. The fact that it is estimated that there will be 600,000 more Puerto Ricans in the city in 1970 is the basis for the belief that the city can continue to staff the garment industry.[20]

Their experience as union members can, in turn, be crucial to the development of New York's Puerto Rican community. Since they find it difficult to adjust to many of the features of American urban life, a good experience in a union, with its development of a core of Puerto Rican leaders, can help to ease the transition into the larger society.

The integration of Spanish-speaking Latin Americans, primarily Puerto Ricans, is also important from the point of view of minorities and low incomes. First of all, the skirt industry in its postwar expansion has provided a job market for more than 4000 Latin Americans. Second, the union's collective agreement guarantees them a basic minimum wage. Beyond that, their degree of acceptance by both employers and the union, and the attempt by the union to integrate them into its ranks, enhance their ability to rise to more skilled and better paying jobs. General union advances, including fringe benefits, also play their part in maintaining incomes of Latin American workers.

Despite recent disclosures that Puerto Rican workers have been the victims of "sweetheart" agreements between unscrupulous unions and employers, the existence of the Labor Advisory Committee on Puerto Rican Affairs, and the interest in it displayed by many unions in New York, would offer hope that the successful experience of Local 23, ILGWU, in the integration of its Puerto Rican and other Latin American members will be duplicated in other industries and by other unions.

---

[19] Puerto Rican Migration to New York City, Bulletin, Department of City Planning, The City of New York, Feb. 1957, p. 1.

[20] The Future of the New York Apparel Industry, 1952-1970, New York: Regional Plan Association, 1953, p. 1.

Chapter IX

PROGRESS TOWARD INTEGRATION:
Four Case Studies

Sally Backer and Harry C. Harris

Introduction

Substantial economic progress was made by Negroes in New York State between 1940 and 1950. Fairly significant advances were registered, especially by Negro women in clerical occupations and Negro men in semiskilled positions. Over the decade Negroes held an increasing variety of jobs; and fewer were engaged in domestic and unskilled occupations.

Progress was also evident in the industrial distribution of Negroes. In various industrial classifications, by 1950 the proportion of Negroes more nearly equaled their proportion of the total population. This was particularly marked in transportation, construction, and durable goods manufacturing. Negroes also commanded higher incomes at the end of the decade, both in terms of the absolute income of the group and of the relative income position of Negroes to whites.

Nonetheless, a decided difference in the economic position of whites and Negroes was still apparent in 1950. In numbers and proportions, Negroes lagged far behind whites in occupations offering high status and above-average monetary rewards. In many industries, the proportion of Negroes in the labor force was low and, in some cases, almost negligible. The reduction of the income differential, though advanced, was not nearly complete. All in all, the ten-year period witnessed significant advances, but the economic differential between Negroes and whites was far from eliminated.

What has happened to Negroes between 1950 and 1958? There can be no definite answer. In the absence of census or other dependable data we have no reliable way of measuring the economic progress of

Negroes during these past eight years. There are, however, certain factors which provide the basis for a reasoned estimate. In general, it can be said that, whatever index of economic progress is used -- income, occupational and industrial distribution, education, or housing -- many thousands of Negroes now have opportunities not available to them even at the end of the 1940-50 decade.

The generalization is based on a number of factors. First of all, the forces making for economic advancement between 1940 and 1950 have generally continued into the current decade. High among these forces was the condition of full or nearly-full employment that marked the state's economy till the end of 1957. While the labor supply was still short, industry had to reach increasingly into the minority group to satisfy its labor needs. As a consequence, more Negroes had probably been employed in the first three quarters of this decade, and for longer periods, than at any other period in history. This has contributed directly to the level of income commanded by Negroes and tended also to disperse Negroes more widely throughout industry.

Another important factor operative during the forties has been even more pronounced during the fifties, i.e., the significance of the Negro labor force of New York State. Historically, the absence of Negroes in various industries and occupations could be explained simply in terms of the relative absence of Negroes in the population. This became less possible during World War II and is impossible today. About 1.2 million Negroes presently reside in New York State. Negroes also have a high labor force participation rate. Industry can no longer overlook this group as a source of labor supply. Thus more Negroes and a higher proportion of Negroes are employed today than heretofore simply because they are a more significant segment of the labor force.

The numerical significance of the Negro population has affected their employment in another direction too. New York's 1.2 million Negroes are also consumers, and companies in highly competitive industries can no longer ignore this consumer-group. In some cases Negroes have become more conscious of their growing influence in the consumer market, and have been known to withdraw their support from products of discriminating companies. The Brewery Study (Ch. VII) is an example. To counteract this, or in anticipation of it, various firms have instituted employment policies based on merit since 1940. Negro employment has swelled, as a result, especially in sales occupations.

The general community has been made increasingly aware of the disadvantaged status of Negroes as well as of the moral need to rectify it. A new climate of opinion has helped open economic opportunities for Negroes both in public and private service. Union, management, and governmental officials have responded by instituting more positive employment policies and practices. These trends have become more pronounced, articulate, and conscious over the last eight years. More Negroes have achieved occupational standing in keeping with their skills during this decade.

Years of prosperity have also had a cumulative effect in the Negro community since 1950. Higher and more stable incomes resulting from full employment coupled with training in the armed forces has materially advanced the qualifications for jobs. Greater qualitative and quantitive training, in turn, have enabled Negro youth to aspire to and compete for better occupations. Increasingly, though far from completely, their aspirations are being realized.

Another factor has been the advantageous position during this decade of Negroes in the age-ranges best suited for employment. Comparatively, New York Negroes have had a better distribution in the years 20-35 than New York whites. This has allowed them to compete with whites on a more nearly equal basis. This advantage is only temporary; by 1960 the age-distribution of the white population will again be nearly in balance. Partly as a result of this distribution, higher economic status has been concentrated to a large degree among younger Negroes. Most Negro clerical workers were under 35 and most domestics over 45 in 1950. Since more Negroes now tend to go into clerical than domestic work, the proportion of domestics in the Negro labor force is diminishing and the ratio of clerical workers is growing.

Other trends, however, are still opposed to these factors making for progress. Some of these inhibiting influences are discussed elsewhere in this volume. The most recent and unpredictable is the business recession that appeared to be growing during the early months of 1958. None can be overlooked in any objective attempt to assess the progress made by the group and its future prospects. Yet it should not be over-optimistic to expect that the gains achieved so far in this decade will not be erased in the next.

One of the more important forces improving opportunities for Negroes has been the fair employment practices legislation of New York State. In case after case and in industry after industry, the Law and its enforcing agency have led companies to institute or implement employment policies based on merit alone, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin. At times, changes in policies have been effected with relative ease and often on a voluntary basis. In other instances, changes have been brought about only through the application of sanctions, or the threat of sanctions provided by law. Such changes, however achieved, have made a major advance toward the elimination of discriminatory practices in the state.

SCAD's impact has grown progressively since 1950, for a number of reasons. The Commission has had seven years to operate in this decade, as opposed to only four and a half in the last. Moreover, the work of the Commission during the forties proved valuable in gaining acceptance of the Law in the business community. In recent years, expansion of staff, command of additional resources, and a more positive orientation have led to its added effectiveness.

To illustrate the Commission's role in the Negro's progress, we have chosen four cases from the Commission's files. Analysis of the record was supplemented by interviews with executives in the four corporations. They are not necessarily representative of the industries of which they form a part. Indeed, the industries are not even representative of the ones with which SCAD has had dealings.

With these limitations, however, the case studies do reveal various aspects worth study. They pose some of the problems that Negroes, companies, and the Commission face in effecting conditions in employment based on merit, and point up some of the processes whereby integration in employment has been achieved. While not applicable to all situations, they reveal the steps that can be taken by other companies to achieve nondiscriminatory employment policies and patterns.

The cases reported here are limited to employment situations involving Negroes. While the workload of the Commission has a high proportion of such cases, other victims of discrimination and other forms are treated with equal consideration by the Commission. In some instances, for example, the denial of employment opportunities falls with greater weight on Puerto Ricans than on Negroes; and discrimination in public accommodations is often directed against religious groups. Nonetheless, cases involving Negroes in employment illustrate many of the problems and conditions faced by other minority groups in other situations as well.

I. A BANKING INSTITUTION

New York City is predominant in the field of finance and banking. The downtown area of Manhattan is almost synonomous with, and to a large degree symbolizes, the monetary, credit, savings, and investment structure of the nation's economy. The bank under review represents a major unit in this structure and is a significant employer of labor in New York City. The size of the labor force of the bank is an effect of its large-scale financial transactions, as well as the result of a merger of two separate banking institutions. Currently the bank employs several thousand non-supervisory employees and an additional several hundred persons in administrative and technical positions. A majority of the employees work in the main offices of the bank with the remainder in branches throughout New York City.

General clerical workers constitute the largest category of the bank's employees, followed, in order, by bookkeepers, tellers, IBM personnel, typists and guards. There is a relatively high turnover in banking employment, particularly in the bookkeeping department, perhaps because most of the employees are women and for many it is their first job. Job openings occur with greatest frequency in positions requiring only a small degree of specialized training and experience. For these the bank uses a wide variety of sources in its recruitment program: private, and to a lesser extent, public and sectarian employment agencies; high school and college placement services; employee recommendations; newspaper advertisements; and "walk-ins." Openings in higher level occupations, on the other hand, are almost universally filled from within the bank by promotions.

As with most banks, the employees are not organized. Beginning wage rates are about on a par with those paid for analagous occupations in other industries. They are lower, however, than the wages and salaries paid for critically short white-collar occupations by a limited number of prestige firms in downtown and midtown Manhattan. The proportion of women in the labor force is extremely high, again typifying the pattern exhibited in the industry as a whole.

Banks have lagged behind many industries in affording opportunities for Negroes to achieve occupational standing in keeping with their aspirations, aptitudes, and educational attainments. Employment of Negroes in bank branches in mainly Negro areas was achieved only recently. In Harlem this was effected mainly as a result of considerable agitation on the part of the Negro community. Once gained, however, integration proceeded fairly smoothly. This was especially true on the lower occupational levels and was particularly pronounced, prior to the merger, in one of the banks under consideration.

This bank (hereafter referred to as Bank A) was first charged with discriminatory employment policies and practices in late 1946. During the course of the investigation of the specific complaint, it was disclosed that Bank A had established a training course for Negro clerical workers during the war. Thereafter, Negroes were employed as tellers, adjusters, clerks, and stenographers in a branch in a Negro area. Subsequently, a number of white employees asked to be, and were, transferred away from the branch, though they later asked to be and were reassigned there. Since this period, integration in employment has progressed substantially in Bank A branches catering to a largely Negro clientele. Bank spokesmen, however, reported that Negro employees during this period tended to resent objective criticisms, exhibited a high turnover rate, and were poorly prepared for employment in the industry.

The 1946 complaint concerned the discriminatory refusal to employ a Negro in the main offices of Bank A. Though the specific complaint was not sustained, it was found that Negroes were not employed in clerical capacities at these offices. While the financial institution claimed the highest number of Negroes employed in white-collar positions by banks in New York City in 1946, it could not demonstrate a beginning toward integration in its main offices. Reviews of the employment pattern of Bank A in March and September 1947 showed no change in this situation. Negroes were effectively barred from main office employment, no matter what the reasons. In contrast, employment of Negroes in branch offices in predominantly Negro areas continued to progress. From twenty at the beginning of the investigation, the number rose to thirty in the fall of 1947. Parallel with this was an effort to upgrade Negroes to higher positions and to disperse Negroes to other branches in mainly Negro areas.

In 1951 a complaint was filed with the Commission again citing an alleged discriminatory practice with respect to employment in the bank's main offices. The complaint was found to have merit; it was determined that the bank had practiced discrimination in violation of the Law and the complainant was afforded the opportunity to secure the first vacancy in her occupational category occuring in the main offices of the bank.

During the course of the investigation, the vice president in charge of personnel frankly admitted that the race, creed, color, and national origin of applicants and employees was a consideration in the employment and assignment of personnel. Not all residents of New York City, in the official's view, were "ready" to be served by Negro tellers. According to the spokesman, Negroes who were hired were assigned to branches in Negro areas where they would "fit in." This was done "largely for their own good." As for the main offices of the bank, he believed that the other employees would object to having Negroes work there. Further, he expressed the opinion that "forcing" Negroes into positions where they would not be accepted would create tensions resulting in poor work-output and would be detrimental to the company as well as unpleasant for the employees. Upgrading procedures were also governed, according to the official, by this belief. Finally, in answer to a hypothetical question, he said that he would not hire a Negro secretary if a vacancy existed and the individual was qualified. Shortly thereafter, the official telephoned to withdraw this statement, saying that a qualified Negro would be hired if a vacancy occurred. He said it would "look very bad" if his answer was allowed to stand. This was not so much an actual change in attitude, of course, as it was evidence of a new conception of what the attitude "should" be (see the detailed discussion of this question in Chapter VI).

With the finding of probable cause in this case, the management of Bank A began to modify its employment policies and practices. In a conference the bank assured the investigating commissioner of its desire to achieve a fair employment pattern in the main offices and branches. Further discussion disclosed, however, that little information covering the responsibilities of staff personnel under the Law was being disseminated by top management. As a result, other personnel were unaware of their obligations under the new policy and the Law. The conference also brought out the fact that the bank had failed to display the official SCAD poster in the main and branch offices of the unit. Thus applicants were not readily cognizant of their rights, nor employees of their duties.

After the conferences, the Commission poster was displayed; fair employment policy and procedure directives were issued to managerial personnel; private employment agencies utilized by the company were informed that applicants would be accepted on the basis of qualifications alone; solicitation of high schools was extended to areas yielding a higher proportion of Negro applicants; and the bank agreed to utilize the referral services of agencies such as the Urban League, specializing in the employment problems of minority groups.

The results were fruitful if not outstanding. By 1952 at least three Negro clerks were working in the main offices of Bank A. An undetermined number had been placed in various branches. Increasingly, Negroes were serving in units outside Negro areas and gaining promotions to higher positions. The bank and the Urban Legaue reported that the referral service was functioning satisfactorily between them. By the time of the review and as late as 1953, however, employment in Bank A had not yet become truly integrated.

Bank B provides a more positive example. The first investigation of the firm came about in August 1951 as the result of a complaint alleging discrimination based on creed. The charge was dismissed when no evidence to sustain the allegations was found. In the course of the examination of the firm's employment pattern it was revealed that nine Negroes were in white-collar employment in the main offices of the firm and fifteen others in more or less traditional Negro occupations. Negroes were not relegated to Negro areas alone, but had been given employment in branches servicing a mixed or mainly white clientele. The integration of Negro personnel, moreover, had resulted from a decision by the executive board of the bank that employment of Negroes was both "necessary and desirable." This had been effected over a number of years. Nonetheless, the proportion of Negroes to the total labor force was low in 1951. When this was brought to the bank's attention, officials of the institution readily agreed to rectify the situation by expanding recruitment sources and removing all possible barriers to employment on the basis of merit.

A review of Bank B two years later indicated substantial progress. At least forty Negroes were in clerical and other white-collar positions and served in almost all of the branches of bank, regardless of neighborhood character. Discriminatory employment procedures had been eliminated. The attitude of the management was such that the Commissioner decided that no other review of the bank's practices was necessary.

When banks A and B merged, their racial employment patterns varied and were to a large extent in direct contrast. In such a situation, the development of employment policies could either inhibit or promote democratic practices. Fortunately, the relatively negative attitudes and values of Bank A were subordinated to the more positive ones of Bank B. This development, in turn, may be attributed in part to the strength of Bank B vis-a-vis Bank A. The personnel director of Bank B became the supervisor of personnel in the merged institution, and the policy was therefore directed by a person apparently more amenable to merit employment than his counterpart. The fact that Bank A was undergoing a transition favoring fair employment at the time of the merger contributed to the advance. The merger tended to accelerate the trend.

Another stimulus was the growing economic strength and growing political and social consciousness of the New York Negro community. Neither as separate firms nor as a merged institution could the two banks, in a highly competitive industry, give offense to this, or indeed to any, group. Denial of employment opportunities could only jeopardize the image of the banks in the Negro community. A negative image of the banks could only lead, as it often has, to a loss of business in the Negro community. Finally, the merger occured in New York City in an atmosphere conducive to integration. As with any institution, the merged bank shared in and reflected the orientation of the place and time: it moved with the community and helped move the community toward more equalitarian policies and practices.

Various problems remained after the merger. Some branch managers were reluctant to integrate Negroes into positions having direct contact with the public. Negroes were not in evidence in the extensive college-trainee program of the bank, a program usually leading to positions in management. Officials also reported that productivity was thought to be lower in branches staffed mainly by Negroes than in those with mixed or all white personnel. Officers of the bank attributed the situation to a belief on the part of branch managers that Negroes were less efficient than white workers; to compensate for this, they tended to assign less work to Negro personnel, thus lowering productivity. The belief was also prevalent that standards were lowered for personnel in mainly Negro areas, a factor making for less efficiency and lower productivity. That this practice was without objective justification may be noted in connection with current practices. Today distinctions are not made in workload assignments or in recruitment standards; accordingly, problems do not arise in terms of productivity or efficiency. A final problem appeared to be in a shortage of qualified Negro candidates, as measured by the lack of Negroes applying for positions and the high rate of failures evidenced by Negro applicants in tests administered by the bank.

Despite these problems, a review of the employment situation of the bank in December 1957 demonstrated considerable progress. At least sixty Negroes were employed in the main offices of the bank, as opposed to nine a decade earlier. Approximately the same number were working in various branches throughout the city. Another group of almost equal numerical strength was located in branches serving mainly Negro communities.

In addition, written instructions had been issued to all employees concerned with hiring, listing the responsibilities of supervisory personnel under the law. The policy in this respect was also conveyed to supervisors in the course of their standard training program. Individual talks with supervisors had proven effective in dealing with resistance to integration. A further expression of formal policy was seen in the prominent display in both main and branch offices of SCAD posters proclaiming nondiscriminatory employment practices.

When interviewed in 1957 an assistant manager in one of the large clerical departments of the bank's main office commented on how well the employees worked together. This particular department had over 500 workers on different shifts. There were at least thirty Negroes on the morning shift working at various clerical tasks. The Negro girls were not segregated and the department supervisor reported that all the girls ate together and afterwards often went to a nearby shopping center. No problems seemed to arise as a result of integration. The assistant manager was pleased with the attitudes and work output of all her employees.

In November 1957 the Urban League was still referring applicants for employment. There have been forty-two referrals in the past year, and the personnel department at the bank encourages the League to check on results in all cases where applicants have been referred by the agency. This successful relationship indicates a real effort to implement and publicize nondiscriminatory employment practices.

In addition to increased agency sources, the bank today uses newspaper advertisements when vacancies occur and keeps in contact with high schools throughout the city. The personnel department regularly sends literature to the high schools and it is the policy of the bank to make personal contact with as many of the schools as possible during the year. In addition, the bank participates in a "co-op" plan for high school students whereby they work one week and attend school the next. This plan is administered through the schools by the Board of Education. The bank also has high school students employed on a part-time basis. A representative from the personnel department reports that both groups of high school employees have worked out extremely well and are encouraged to come to the bank on a permanent basis after graduation. These varied methods of recruitment constitute a strong indication that there is no intent on the part of the bank to limit its personnel on the basis of race, creed, color, or national origin.

II. A MANUFACTURING CONCERN

The corporation is engaged in the manufacture of durable goods and their distribution on a national and international scale. Three of the plants and the executive offices of the concern are located in the New York-Northeastern New Jersey Metropolitan Area. Ranked on the basis of "value added by manufacturer," size and composition of labor force, and product reputation, the concern holds a preeminent position in its industry and constitutes a vital manufacturing complex in New York State's economy. It currently employs in excess of 4000 workers, including substantial numbers in each occupational category and above-average representation in scientific and technical, clerical, and skilled crafts. The accession and turnover rates of the firm appear to be average for the industry as a whole. Trade union agreements are in force.

The first investigation of the employment policies and practices of the firm occurred in June 1951. Previously, the Commission had dealt with the firm in revising the corporation's employment application form. This was a standard procedure immediately following the passage of fair employment practices legislation in New York State and one not necessarily indicating either the presence or absence of discrimination. However, in June 1951 the Commission received information from a highly responsible source indicating the possible existence of practices deterring or preventing the employment of Negroes in clerical and other capacities in the executive offices of the corporation. The Commission thereupon initiated an investigation. In such a procedure -- one which does not involve the filing of a verified complaint by a specific individual charging a respondent with a discriminating act against the individual -- the Commission is not empowered to act in its quasi-judicial character nor may sanctions be invoked against the respondent. The Commission may, however, utilize its educational and conference and conciliation techniques; and it may suggest certain actions designed to gain compliance with the letter and spirit of fair employment legislation. This was the course followed in this particular case.

Staff personnel of the Commission were allowed to review the firm's recruitment and employment policies and procedures, check relevant records, and make inspections to determine the racial and ethnic composition of the company's labor force. The information revealed that twelve Negroes were working in the executive offices of the firm out of a total labor force of almost 1000. All of the Negroes were employed in maintenance. Moreover, the recruitment policies of the company, with the exception of newspaper advertisements, were not likely, in the Commission's judgment to change the existing racial imbalance. High priorities were given to recommendations by employees, almost exclusively white; to private employment agencies, none of which had significant numbers of Negro clients; and to various colleges, universities, and technical institutes, the student bodies of which contained few Negroes. Newspaper advertisements did in fact attract Negro applicants. However, the personnel department of the firm reported that none of the Negro applicants met the company's qualifications.

Based on the information gained, the investigating commissioner wrote to the firm in July 1951, saying that:

> "Although I am not prepared to say that this [employment pattern] indicates any discrimination against... Negroes, nevertheless, there is a suspicion that... [Negroes] are not better represented in your employment rolls because of some defect in your recruitment practices or reluctance on the part of those charged with the responsibility of hiring to more fully integrate Negroes... ."

He then made a number of suggestions designed to advance the racial integration of the firm's labor force: (1) Continue to refrain from discriminating against any applicant for employment or any employee because of race, creed, color, or national origin. (2) Afford equal opportunities and considerations to applicants and employees in the terms, compensation, conditions, or privileges of employment. (3) Under the president's signature, notify all personnel of the company's policy in this regard and of its intent and the obligations of the personnel to comply with the Law. (4) Ascertain the attitudes of employment personnel toward Negro applicants and employees and, where necessary, correct them through the use of educational techniques. (5) Inform employment agencies utilized by the company of its fair employment policy and notify them to conform. (6) Utilize high schools and colleges in New York City which more nearly reflect the racial composition of the area's labor force. (7) Remove any other barriers to the full integration of Negroes into the corporation's work force.

The company expressed surprise that a charge of discrimination had been leveled against it and in any manner confirmed by the

Commission. It reiterated strongly its avowed policy of employment based on merit, but assured SCAD that it would comply with its suggestions and recommendations.

Subsequent correspondence between the firm and the Commission in the summer of 1951 indicated that the manufacturer had carried out the suggestions, except in the case of items (4), (6), and (7). The firm noted that high schools were not generally used for recruitment, and that it was not aware of any existing barriers to integration. There was no comment concerning the attitudes of personnel engaged in the employment process.

Contact continued over the next year and a half, but no review was made of the employment pattern of the company. In September 1954 the commissioner arranged a conference with the company's personnel director, and pointed out that while the Commission was without enforcement powers in this specific case, it was nonetheless interested here, as elsewhere, in obtaining compliance with the Law. It was the commissioner's belief that the company had acquired a reputation of engaging in discriminatory practices, at least as far as office personnel was concerned. The corporation executive responded that "the situation is not any better than it was, but this is not due to any lack of effort on our part." In support of this, he noted that the firm had hired a Negro girl as a typist but she had left the company because of family reasons. While she had worked out "fine," her Negro replacement had been incompetent and the company was forced to discharge her. Because of this, Negroes were not currently employed in clerical positions. A similar situation existed for scientific and technical personnel. In both cases, according to the company spokesman, Negroes had not been found who met the qualifications. He noted that the company would have to change the employment climate with respect to Negro office personnel; while there was no hostility, there was nonetheless a tradition of exclusion to overcome in this category.

The commissioner asked for more affirmative action since the recommendations and suggestions had not resulted in any appreciable change. He cautioned that the Commission would not view the corporation's obligations as discharged through the "token" employment of Negroes.

The foregoing proceedings led to an investigation of the employment pattern of two of the plants in November and December 1954. In the smaller of the two, Commission personnel found, in some respects, "... an unusually good pattern of the utilization of all population elements." Of several hundred production workers, approximately 30 percent were Negro. This is far in excess of the labor force participation rate of Negroes in New York State. Negroes were found working in most occupations and all production divisions; a few had supervisory jobs and at least two held responsible, technical positions. The personnel director attributed the success of integration in the plant to a number of factors among which was the utilization of the services of the State Employment Service.

The office picture, however, was in direct contrast. None of the hundred employees was Negro. The personnel director explained this in terms of the plant's location in a poor neighborhood where aspirations among Negroes toward white-collar employment were thought to be low. In addition, he said that one Negro woman had been offered clerical employment but turned the position down. It is to be noted that beginning salaries were lower for clerical than for production workers.

The other plant showed, on the production level, a pattern similar in quality if not in quantity to that detailed above. About 150 workers were Negro. Negroes were found in both the foundry and the fabricating division, with a relatively slight predominance in the foundry. The management held that since Negroes tended to have lower-skilled craft and educational levels, job opportunities were greater for this group in the foundry where unskilled and semi-skilled occupations prevailed. Moreover, Negroes had worked in southern foundries and often sought similar jobs when migrating North. However, as the occupational and educational status of the group advanced, more and more Negroes found employment at higher skill levels in the fabricating division of the plant.

Occupational mobility for Negroes in the plant has been achieved through a number of methods. Greatest weight was placed by the plant management on on-the-job training and attendant occupational upgrading. Higher rank was also achieved through bringing in skilled Negroes from other manufacturing establishments.

However, only one Negro had obtained a position directing the work of others. Commenting on this situation in January 1958, the personnel director of the plant attributed the dearth of Negroes in supervisory positions to a number of factors. First of all, turnover in supervisory personnel was extremely low; thus, openings were few. Second, individuals considered for supervisory positions must usually be young enough to continue on that level for a considerable time, thus justifying to the company the costs inherent in the advancement of a skilled craftsman to near-managerial rank. Most Negro skilled craftsmen, however, were older, having attained artisan rank only after long-time employment and training and upgrading with the company. Third, supervisory positions often paid less than a number of skilled craft occupations. According to the company, this wage differential was the principal reason that had led a Negro employee to reject a supervisory position for which he was being considered. Finally, the company attributed the lack of Negroes in engineering and technical positions to the lack of Negroes applying for these occupations. The plant recruits trainees from colleges to be used as potential material for supervisory personnel. According to the director of the training division at one plant, most Negro college students preferred the traditional professions rather than engineering. In 1956 a Negro was employed as a process engineer-trainee. By 1958 the personnel director could cite only one other instance where a Negro engineer was in competition for a position. He said that the individual seemed very able and that "we asked him to come down for a final interview, but he called and said he'd been offered a better deal with another outfit." The reluctance of white employees to work under the supervision of Negroes had apparently small weight in this plant. This is inferred from the positive climate of intergroup relations in the plant and from the fact that a Negro recently served as president of the plant's major union.

The major plant showed a low number of Negroes in clerical jobs. The personnel director said that Negroes did not apply for white-collar positions because of their lack of training for office work, at least in the community from which the plant drew most of its employees. One reason for this was the pay differential between office and plant personnel. In November 1954 the clerical employees averaged about 50 percent of the wages of production workers. As a result, both Negroes and whites aspired to, and applied for, production jobs. This made for a critical shortage of trained clerical personnel, both Negro and white.

Subsequent occurrences in this plant tend to throw doubt on the argument that Negroes were not employed in white-collar occupations because of the lack of qualified applicants. A verified complaint was filed with SCAD in 1956 charging that the company discriminated against a clerical applicant because of color. Investigation revealed that Negro applicants for office positions were given tests not given to white applicants. A finding of probable cause sustaining the allegations was made by the investigating commissioner. The individuals responsible for the practice were severely reprimanded by the corporation, and warned that they would be fired upon any recurrence of such activity. In his memorandum the personnel director wrote that "you will also note that, while this... has been written at the request [of the investigating commissioner] the company is wholeheartedly behind the [non-discriminatory] policies outlined...and violation of the principle or policy will not be tolerated." While there is no precise relationship between the findings in this case and the employment of other Negro clerical personnel in the plant, it may be noted that six Negroes gained employment in clerical positions during this period: one IBM technician; one IBM key-punch operator; one comptometer operator; and three clerks. Three complaints charging the company with discriminatory practices have been lodged with the Commission since the above determination. In two, both involving Negroes and skilled occupations, no probable cause was found to sustain the charges. The third is pending.

SCAD has had continuing relations with the corporation in recent years. In the main, this has consisted of efforts to achieve equal job opportunities in the company's executive offices. A conference in the fall of 1956 revealed that the company was currently employing two Negro typists. Later, both women were promoted to ediphone operators. Commenting on this, a company executive said, "we had a devil of a time getting them." The commissioner noted that this did not "jibe" with the experience of other firms in New York City. Later conversations brought out that the company was obtaining Negro applicants but did not find them qualified for office positions. No appreciable change had occurred by January 1958.

On the whole, then, the manufacturing concern has shown a positive record over the years in almost all production jobs and fairly steady progress in white-collar employment at the plants. This improvement is not as evident in the employment of supervisory or technical personnel. It is not true at all with respect to white-collar employment in the main offices of the concern.

III. A COMMUNICATIONS CORPORATION

The firm is a major unit in the communications industry centering in New York City and linking the principal areas of the country and the world. The company has its major offices in Manhattan and acts as a holding company for a number of operating subsidiaries. The main offices of the subsidiaries and their branch divisions constitute an important segment of the telecommunications industry. In 1950 the total industry employed 63, 840 persons in the New York portion of the New York-Northeastern New Jersey Standard Metropolitan Area. Of these, 1781 were Negroes. Thus Negroes constituted about 3 percent of the labor force in this category, about half of the ideal participation rate of the group in the area.

The first contact of the Commission with the corporation occurred in 1951 in connection with the filing of a verified complaint charging the company with discharging an employee because of the complainant's creed. In contrast to the situation discussed previously, the Commission had full powers to investigate the complaint and the employment pattern; to adjust by conference and conciliation any and all unfair employment policies and practices; and, if probable cause confirming the allegations were found, to issue specific directives aimed at the elimination of barriers to merit employment. Failure of a respondent to conform to such directives could lead to a public hearing. If the allegations were sustained by three commissioners of the agency, SCAD was empowered to issue cease and desist orders and take other actions necessary to gain compliance. Ultimately, these orders and actions were enforceable, after review, through contempt proceedings in courts of competent jurisdiction.

In the present case, the full course of action described above was not necessary. The allegation was not sustained and, in general, the corporation was found to be conforming to the Law. Information obtained during the course of the investigation revealed that the company had instituted fair employment policies and practices prior to the passage of fair employment practices legislation in 1945. Nonetheless the Commission, with the full cooperation of the corporation, sought to initiate measures designed to achieve a fuller integration of the firm's labor force.

As a first step, the employment application form of the company was revised to conform to Commission rulings. Questions on naturalization and organizational affiliations -- queries which could conceivably establish the race, color, creed, or national origin of an applicant -- were either modified or eliminated. The company reaffirmed its policy of merit employment through a directive issued by the president. Bulletins and memoranda were issued to all persons having key roles in the employment process. In each instance these detailed specific procedures which were to be followed in implementing Commission and company policy. The official poster of SCAD was placed in all branch divisions, as well as in the main offices of the concern, thus affording to applicants and employees alike a graphic representation of their rights and obligations under the Law. Commission literature, including a special piece devoted to general practices in the communications industry, was given wide currency by the company among its employees. Finally, the sources of recruitment used by the company were widened to include those serving Negroes.

These measures, in conjunction with those previously instituted, led to a broader distribution of minority group members. A recent inspection of the corporation revealed that Negroes were employed in all operating classifications and in almost all departments and divisions of the firm. There was no segregation in the deployment of the labor force. Tendencies on the part of Negroes to form cliques were substantially eliminated. Negroes participated actively in various voluntary activities sponsored by the corporation. According to the company, Negro workers were found to be very satisfactory.

In contrast to many firms, Negroes here were not concentrated in the lowest occupational categories. Rather, most Negroes were employed as teletype operators, where they composed about 15 percent of the employees in this category. Integration of Negroes at this job level occurred in 1950 and can be traced directly to their training in the armed forces. Negroes also appeared in above-average numbers in the accounting division of the firm. They were employed in various IBM machine operations. Most of the remainder served in general clerical and service capacities.

Negroes have achieved higher clerical and supervisory positions through an upgrading process which is based on merit and seniority. One Negro serves as a branch manager; another as a division supervisor; and another as an assistant supervisor. In all three cases, white personnel come under the Negro's supervision and in no case has tension or friction arisen. Negroes are also employed as statisticians and at least one as a draftsman. Apparently, Negroes have not applied for engineering positions, for which there is an acute shortage and in which the company, according to spokesmen, would have no hesitancy in hiring them.

The corporation does not, however, employ high-level Negro secretaries, salesmen, or executives. An official commented on the lack of Negroes as private secretaries by referring to the personal relationship that exists between an executive and his secretary. In most cases he said, "you'll find that an executive when choosing a secretary will stick to his own. A secretary is his alter ego, and nine times out of ten you'll have, say, a Jewish boss with a Jewish secretary and so forth." For his own secretary, he did not believe he would object to a Negro: "Theoretically I don't think I'd mind, but then the situation has never come up so I'm not sure that that answer is entirely correct. Can't really say how I'd feel if I actually had to decide." The lack of Negroes in sales positions is attributed by the company to the lack of Negroes applying for these occupations. Another factor here, however, may be the reluctance of the company to employ Negroes in jobs entailing direct contact with customers. This is surmise alone, since the records of the company do not contain any reference to the race of sales applicants. No explanation was offered regarding the absence of Negroes as executives.

In addition to the relations effected between SCAD and the corporation because of this case, the parties have maintained a continuing association through the Communications Council, an advisory body to SCAD. Created in 1951, the Council has as its principal purpose the exchange of information on the problems and progress of ethnic and racial integration in the communications industry centered in New York State. The exchange between the participating companies and SCAD has proved extremely helpful in effecting integration in sectors of the industry where progress had previously been slow. The experiences of the corporation analyzed here have been valuable in gaining the cooperation of less well integrated companies in the educational programs of SCAD.

The Council published a pamphlet, Communications and Fair Employment, which not only places emphasis on integration and its beneficial results to employers but stresses the fact that skill, experience, and aptitude are required for many of the positions held by Negro employees. This orientation tends to promote the status and prestige of minority group members. The pamphlet, moreover, had proved useful in accelerating the integration of Negroes in other industries. In addition, the Council has been active in the promulgation of fair employment principles through the use of other media and various forums. Thus, in a variety of ways the experiences of the corporation have been communicated through the efforts of the Council and gained widespread interest and applicability.

IV. A MERCHANDISING FIRM

Nationally known, the company in New York City has undergone a transition in functions and a decrease in the size of its labor force since 1946. The retail activities of the company, formerly centered in a wholly-owned subsidiary, have been discontinued and its New York City office is presently engaged in the merchandising and distribution of various durable and non-durable consumer goods. Elsewhere in the state, and increasingly so in suburban areas, the company is in direct contact with consumers through a network of retail outlets. The national headquarters of the firm in 1946 was located in a non-FEPC state; the same situation held for the center controlling the outlets of the firm in upper New York State. Employment in New York City has decreased by about one-third between 1946 and 1956. Turnover is relatively small. There are no union agreements.

From October 1946 to December 1957 eight verified complaints had been filed with SCAD against the company. Six of these involved allegations based on color; one on creed; and one on national origin. Three had been lodged against the New York City unit; three against suburban stores; and two against outlets in major upstate cities. In the seven cases decided to date, probable cause -- sustaining either the specific allegations of a complainant or indicating other discriminatory practices -- was found and adjusted in three instances. SCAD made periodic reviews of the employment policies and practices of the firm during the ten-year period under view. These reviews were designed to measure the efficacy of recommendations rendered in various cases and to ascertain the general progress of the firm toward compliance with the Law.

An investigation in 1946 of the New York City branch revealed that, of over 1000 employees only 35 were Negro, far below the expected ratio in New York City. Moreover, Negroes were employed only as matrons, porters, packers, and taggers. Investigation of the specific complaint -- failure to employ a Negro woman as a key-punch operator-trainee -- indicated that the company's management was neither aware of, nor particularly concerned about, its obligations under the Law. The personnel manager, when asked how he evaluated applicants, said that he did so on the basis of "a mental process which I cannot explain." The department head involved, when asked about the absence of Negro white-collar workers, reported that Negroes could not be hired because they could not qualify for the positions.

Given the specific facts in the complaint, and the general employment pattern and attitude of management, SCAD's investigating commissioner found probable cause to sustain the charges of the complainant. The company was directed to provide another employment opportunity for the complainant, revise its employment application blanks, display Commission posters and distribute Commission literature, and revise all steps in the employment process in order to promote employment based on merit. At the same time, management responsible for the upstate operations of the company was called in and agreed to institute procedures designed to assure compliance with the Law. In these conferences, as in every procedure, the Commission placed primary reliance on persuasion. The Commission feels that this creates a better understanding of the Law and its purposes and an atmosphere more conducive to fair employment practices. In most instances, more is gained in the long run by convincing rather than coercing a recalcitrant employer, trade union, or employment agency. This, of course, does not preclude the application of sanctions where necessary.

Whatever the general effects of this policy, it had immediate results in the case of this company. A one-year review showed that the company had eliminated discriminatory employment queries; was using the Urban League of Greater New York as an additional source for recruiting new employees; and had made a "sincere effort to integrate minorities; ...employees are selected solely on their qualifications," according to company spokesmen. During 1947 eleven additional Negroes were employed, bringing the company's total to forty-six. Beginning with a typist and a comptometer operator, Negroes were afforded the opportunity to achieve white-collar positions in keeping with their qualifications. Negroes constituted about 7 percent of all new employees hired in the New York City branch during the period, a generally good ratio. No problems were reported in connection with these integration efforts. Management sources reported that Negro employees worked and associated easily with the other employees, and supervisors seemed uniformly pleased with their performance.

The efforts of SCAD and of the company to integrate the firm's labor force were given added impetus by the Urban League of Greater New York. The agency referred applicants to the firm and maintained a record of the treatment accorded them and the disposition of their applications. This procedure provided SCAD with a rough index to the progress of the company and, on occasions, provided all three parties with a means to check and remedy possible discriminatory practices.

In 1949, another review revealed that the number of Negroes employed in the New York City outlet was about the same as it had been in 1947. However, Negroes had been promoted from within the organization. Thus, there were two Negro workheads, a master distributor, a merchandise inspector, a division head, and an assistant department head. All of these positions involved some measure of supervision and entailed the direction of white employees. No problems relative to integration were reported by the company.

Investigation of a verified complaint in 1956 revealed that the company employed fifty Negroes. Of these thirty were in various non-traditional occupations. The investigating commissioner expressed concern that the number of Negro employees had remained fairly constant for a period of almost ten years. His concern was based on the possibility that a quota system was being used to limit Negro employment, in direct contravention to the rulings of the Commission. The company, however, denied the existence of a quota. The company pointed out that the increase of Negroes was high when it was considered that the total labor force of the firm had fallen by one-third. While Negro employment appeared constant, it had in fact advanced relatively. As a measure of good faith, however, the company agreed to counteract any tendency toward quota employment by reiterating its policy to all persons involved in the employment process. This occurred in a meeting of all department heads and employment personnel in the spring of 1957.

The last review took place in December 1957. This analysis showed that the company was employing at least one Negro as a top-level secretary; one artist; a designer; and a cashier. The company reported that friction had not occurred because of integration and that Negroes participated fully in various events sponsored by employees of the firm. The concern stressed that the same standards are applied to all candidates for employment; and Negro employees are equally as competent and personable as their white co-workers. Such a policy is in direct accord with recommendations of the Commission, and may be one factor in the ease with which the firm has achieved a fair employment pattern.

As previously mentioned, several complaints had also been filed with SCAD against branches of the company outside of New York City. The upstate and New York suburban branches are retail outlets and operate as department stores. The first conference with the regional personnel director of the company held in February 1947 indicated that he was not familiar with the specific provisions of the New York State Law Against Discrimination. He discussed the Law with the commissioner and agreed to call a meeting of all New York State store managers in order to clarify its contents. Subsequent investigations, however, showed that little progress had been made in the upstate stores. In one store, for example, a branch manager reported that there was only one Negro among his forty-three employees. That Negro, moreover, was a maintenance worker. Negroes were not employed in clerical work or in sales positions, although the manager assured the SCAD field representative that he would hire only on the basis of qualifications for a particular job. He agreed at the time to notify the State Employment Service and the Urban League whenever a vacancy occurred.

The investigating commissioner continued to be concerned. Another meeting was called with the regional personnel director in July 1948. The minutes of this meeting reveal some of the problems faced by the personnel director in his effort to initiate nondiscriminatory hiring practices in the retail stores:

> Mr. -- stated that it is a standard practice for his company to instruct its hiring personnel on the laws in force in their respective regions; that in pursuance of this practice his company had distributed copies of our law and of "Inside Facts" to the managers in the various localities in New York State; that not only has such material been distributed but staff meetings were held during which the law was explained and instruction given on how to interview applicants, "regardless of the law," on the theory that if the interview is proper the company is bound to get the most competent help, regardless of race, creed, color or national origin. He explained further that the larger stores had personnel departments which did the hiring while the smaller ones, i.e., those having 10 or 12 employees, had no personnel departments, the managers doing the hiring, in addition to their other duties. It was therefore possible that while the managers of the smaller stores were out or busy, others, having little or no knowledge as to the company's non-discriminatory policy, might turn away qualified applicants. Accordingly, Mr. -- said that he would make it a part of his business on visiting the various stores in this state to again instruct the managers as to the company's policy and to instruct them further not to allow anyone but the proper people to interview applicants.... In this way he hoped to avoid the dissemination of misinformation to applicants as to his company's employment policies. Mr. -- also informed /the commissioner/ that his company has been experimenting with methods of testing applicants objectively, methods that will more and more remove the personal judgment of the interviewer in evaluating applicants; that while some progress has been made in such methods with respect to routinized or menial types of occupations, no progress seems to have been made with methods in testing applicants for sales positions because, as he put it, only one factor can be known in advance, the salesman's personality but not that of the customer, both being needed to devise

> a reliable test. At any rate, it was hoped that the development of objective methods of testing will eliminate more and more factors making for discrimination. His company, asserted Mr. --, was genuinely interested in fair employment practices and in complying with the law of this state, as well as with the various similar laws in other states and municipalities.

The effect of contact between the personnel director and the investigating commissioner was shown in May 1949, when another complaint against the company was filed with the Commission. The commissioner found no evidence to justify the specific complaint, but noted that Negroes were not employed in clerical or sales positions at this branch. Review of the case in December 1949 revealed that all of the supervisory personnel at the store had been changed since the date when the original complaint was filed. However, at the time of the field representative's visit, the new personnel manager was already familiar with the complaint, the Law, and the activities and functions of SCAD.

In his report the field representative noted specifically that the store manager

> stated that he had received very explicit instructions from Mr. -- . Mr. -- , according to him, has iterated and reiterated the policy that there will be no discrimination and that all personnel should be selected on the basis of merit. I gathered from his statement that Mr. -- would not tolerate any infringements of this policy and that strict compliance with the Law Against Discrimination should be the rule.

Despite the positive attitude of the regional personnel manager, integration in sales personnel seems still to be very much in its beginning state. Some progress was indicated in 1953 when several Negroes were found to be employed in sales and clerical work in one of the upstate branches. Investigation of a complaint against a suburban outlet of this company in July 1957, however, showed that the branch employed only one Negro merchandising clerk out of almost 200 employees. Currently, there is a complaint pending against another suburban outlet in which a supposedly qualified Negro was allegedly refused a position in sales. Whether or not the specific complaint will prove to be justified, the repetition of complaints against this company indicates that there is yet much to be accomplished in the way of integration on the retail sales level.

V. CONCLUSIONS

Many years ago the sociologist W. I. Thomas suggested that "if men define situations as real, they are real in their consequences." This chapter is a case in point. In these four cases it can be seen how top management has defined integration in the labor force as a real and desirable possibility. Once a public commitment is made -- whatever its motives -- a number of consequences follow. Fears, hesitations, and difficulties that loomed large before the commitment tend to dissipate. When action is taken, executives, accustomed to acting, do not show undue anxiety. It is found that workers do not protest, qualified applicants do not fail, and clients and customers accept the changes relatively smoothly. This assumes that action follows the commitment, and that it is taken firmly and enforced by the prerogatives open to management.

Furthermore, when executives see what happens once a policy commitment is made, they seem to be strengthened in their conviction that integration works. In part this is undoubtedly due to the fact that, in the main, it does work. And in part it is due to the psychological principle that expectations condition perceptions. This principle, however, does not tell the whole story. The executive is in a position of power. His expectations become an independent variable: his subordinates, seeing that he expects integration to work, will often do their utmost to see that it does.

A gap often exists however, between a verbal commitment and action. In each of these four cases, it is evident that this gap has in some measure been closed. To achieve this a price was paid, and must always be paid. Top executives must be perpetually aware of the nondiscriminatory policy and devote their time to its enforcement. An occasional memorandum will not do the trick. Moreover the gain is only achieved when the acceptance of nondiscrimination moves from policy statements to formal mechanisms for its enforcement. Thus, when formal seniority criteria prevail in upgrading; when formal grievance procedures encompass complaints about discrimination; or when nondiscriminatory policies are part of the supervisory training program, commitment to integration can really become effective. One particular trend in modern corporations reinforces this pattern: scientific management practices tend to eliminate the personal element. At the same time, informal relations and the personal element can not be ruled out. There remains the necessity of periodic reviews by the corporation of the effectiveness of its policy.

It is in this latter respect that SCAD can make a significant contribution. First, and most obvious, contact with SCAD has led many corporations to eliminate specific discriminatory practices. Second, the very existence of the Law Against Discrimination and of its agency has kept these corporations sharply aware of the problem. Third, contact with SCAD -- even where no complaint has been filed -- leads the company to reinspect its own practices. These pressures for self-examination tend to make for greater consistency between public commitment and actual practice. Fourth -- and possibly most important of all -- a reasonable inference can be drawn from some of the data here to support a major conclusion of Chapter VI: management can in a sense shift the responsibility for its actions on to SCAD. It can point to SCAD's existence and pressure as making nondiscriminatory practices a legal imperative. The Commission is perfectly willing and able to accept such responsibility where it is a useful device to quiet hesitation and overcome reluctance. Finally, case III points up the value of a SCAD-sponsored institution: an industry-wide committee. Such a device is usually effective in an industry such as communications with a relatively small number of employers. In a society with many major industries, each constituted primarily by a few large corporations, investment in like committees oftentimes pay handsome returns.

Each section of this chapter documents major gains. What is impressive is not only that they have been made but that enthusiasm usually greets them. Nonetheless, significant problems remain in these companies. Three major ones emerge, all of which seem to be in large part a responsibility of management. First, while the barriers to Negroes in white-collar work are relatively minor, this breakthrough does not extend to their employment in positions of contact with the public. The fear of negative reactions from other employees to merit employment and upgrading has been dissipated; the same fear with regard to the public appears to persist. Second, strong hesitation remains in the employment of Negroes as personal secretaries. This, of course, touches on the heart of Negro-white relations: social and personal contact. Involving relatively few positions, it is yet of great importance. Third, there is the problem of the shortage of qualified Negro applicants for clerical and technical positions. In part, this is doubtless the problem of the Negro community itself. In part, its solution depends upon non-discriminatory training opportunities -- in formal training systems particularly. But part of the answer also lies in management's hands: ever-present and longstanding discrimination has convinced many Negroes that they are not welcome. Often they believe that there is no point in applying for a position, or in going through an arduous training program, even when they are in fact welcome. Management's responsibility lies in disseminating knowledge of this fact in the Negro community.

The lowest entrance salary in these four corporations is $2548 annually, most often made by high school female graduates. This is more often than not a contribution to household income rather than the mainstay of a family. Adult males, particularly if they have skills, command higher income. Such incomes would take many Negro families out of the ranks of the poverty-stricken. The ability to achieve higher occupations and more income, however, is dependent on the institution of nondiscriminatory policies and practices. It can be achieved.

Part Four

A THEORETIC SUMMATION

Chapter X

THE SOCIAL MEANING OF DISCRIMINATION

Aaron Antonovsky*

This chapter is an attempt to contribute to the development of a sociological theory of discrimination. Much work has been directed toward the study of prejudice; many studies describe the extent and costs of discrimination. But no systematic theoretical framework has been developed which can be applied to the way in which discrimination is initiated, perpetuated, and expressed in the United States.[1]

In this discussion we will, first, analyze the nature of discrimination; second, consider its impact on the life chances of its victims; and third, discuss the problems involved in breaking down discriminatory practices.

I. THE NATURE OF DISCRIMINATION

Discrimination as a Social Relationship

Discrimination may be defined as the effective injurious treatment of persons on grounds rationally irrelevant to the situation. Individuals are denied desired and expected rewards or opportunities for reasons related not to their capacities, merits, or behavior, but solely because of membership in an identifiable outgroup.[2] Although a discriminatory relationship bears similarity to a caste system, it is fundamentally different: In both the victims are barred in some degree from access to values such as housing, jobs, educational facilities, full participation in culture, voting, and so forth. In a caste system, however, those excluded accept the barriers as legitimate; whereas in discrimination there is a conflict because the outsiders desire and feel they have a right to the rewards and opportunities which the insiders tend to monopolize. The former find it necessary to challenge this monopoly. This conflict is not primarily the result of a failure in communication; on the contrary, the two contending groups are well informed about their differences in status and power. They share the same goals -- even though they do not achieve them equally.[3] Thus whenever discrimination prevails it is always accompanied by challenge, tension, aggression and defense, and flux.

---

*Appreciation is expressed to Dr. Don J. Hager for his careful critical reading of this paper and his many helpful suggestions.

[1] The memorandum prepared by the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, The Main Types and Causes of Discrimination, New York, 1949; the writings of Myrdal and MacIver; Robin M. Williams, Jr., The Reduction of Intergroup Tensions, New York: Social Science Research Council, 1947; and Chapter V of Morroe Berger's Equality By Statute, New York: Columbia University Press, 1952, are among the works which have had an important impact on the thinking in this field.

Certain conditions are necessary before discrimination will emerge and persist: (1) There must be scarcity of rewards and opportunities, both material and psychic. The greater the scarcity, the greater the pressure for recourse to discrimination. (2) But scarcity is -- beyond the sheer subsistence level -- a culturally-defined concept. There would be no such pressure unless both insiders and outsiders agreed upon the desirability of the scarce values. (3) In order for discrimination to operate, there must be an unequal distribution of power, which enables the insiders to impose their monopoly and perpetuate it. Thus scarcity, shared goals, and unequal power are the necessary conditions for discrimination. Under such conditions, discrimination will become a reality given sufficient motive.

---

[2] Legally, discrimination may refer to preferential, rewarding treatment. Such treatment always implies its converse. Most discussions of discrimination have been limited to its negative aspects, for it is these which constitute the core of the social problem of discrimination.

[3] Cayton and Drake (Black Metropolis, New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1945), pp. 120-127, implicitly adopt this position in discussing Negro-white relations in Chicago. Tension, they point out, arises when both desire the same goals but there is disagreement on whether Negroes should have access to these goals. Where the two agree -- either in not having the same goals, e.g., purely private social relations, or in providing equality of access, e.g., to theaters -- there is no tension.

Discrimination and the Social Structure

We have distinguished between discriminatory relations and a caste system by pointing to the shared values in the former. At the same time we must distinguish between a discriminatory pattern and sporadic, peripheral incidents of discrimination. For example, one may question whether Jew-Gentile or Catholic-Protestant relations in the United States are any longer predominantly discriminatory in character. Despite medical school quotas, country club exclusion, certain housing patterns, job barriers, and so forth, access to opportunities and rewards is generally open to Jews and Catholics; moreover, most of them have learned how to circumvent what restrictions exist by finding substitute gratifications and exploiting interstitial opportunities. (The question of latent prejudice, i.e., what may happen in a crisis, is another problem.) On the other hand, America does assign a subordinate status (in fact, if not in principle) to Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans, Indians, and Oriental-Americans. These groups are regarded as inferior and, by virtue of prejudice and discrimination, remain relatively deprived and in isolation.

There is an important distinction too to be made concerning the centrality of discrimination in the social and psychic structure of a society. The economic, political, social and psychic life of the white South has, in large measure, been predicated upon anti-Negro prejudice and discrimination. In the North, on the other hand, while anti-Negro discrimination is intense and pervasive, its elimination would not require a radical change in the structure of society. This is no reason for being sanguine. While it is true that the nature of northern economic and political life is not built upon the subordinate status of minority groups, patterns of housing occupancy and of voluntary associations are. Perhaps the greatest distinction between North and South is to be found in the centrality of psychic dependence on discrimination by the majority group in the South.

In any case, an examination of the pervasiveness, intensity, and centrality of discrimination in a social system contributes to an understanding of its consequences.

Discrimination as an Institution

The failure to perceive that discrimination is a system of social relations underlies the overemphasis of research on the psychological factor of prejudice. Whatever its psychological origins, discrimination takes place largely outside the realm of the conscious decisions and the freedom of choice of individual persons. It is more than the sum of the

the individuals who discriminate, it is an institution with a process of its own. While we lack sufficient evidence for a full understanding of the social arrangements that create and perpetuate the institution of discrimination, we have theoretical notions to guide us in the search.

There is, first of all, the weight of the past. Traditional patterns -- so long as they appear to serve a function -- are not easily upset. Thus, the fact that one has never hired Negroes, never lived in a mixed neighborhood, or never admitted Jews to a fraternity, continues to carry weight. Habits of the past are not easily extinguished.

Second, social behavior is predominantly role-playing. Acceptable behavior is linked to the expectations attached by society to the roles people occupy. Thus, be the individual a personnel director, guidance counselor, politician, or real estate broker, whatever his personal inclinations, he tends to act as he is expected to act in his position. Only when he receives an indication that the expectations are changed, can he be expected to behave differently. Put simply, the individual who tries to behave differently, i.e., in a non-discriminatory manner, without group sanction, is likely to encounter opposition and hostility.

Third, there are isolating mechanisms in the form of patterns which operate to keep the victims of discrimination from access to the tools necessary to break down the barriers. Obstacles to voting, inadequate educational facilities, apathy-producing poverty, "legal" harassments, exclusion from unions, and other manifestations of discrimination are ways of keeping minority group members from acquiring effective means to challenge the system. The Negro who does not live in an area where neighbors might inform him of a good job opportunity, or who is excluded from an informal plant clique, is isolated from possible rewards.

Fourth, law and other social sanctions often serve to maintain and perpetuate discrimination. The direction in which this operates depends on the climate of opinion and the dominant values of a community. Men are bound, voluntarily or involuntarily, by restrictive covenants, pressure of alumni, associations of business, and other groups.

A fifth factor is the institutionalized evasion of anti-discriminatory policies. There is often a gap between policy formulation and administrative execution. Intentional evasion, lackadaisical enforcement, and ineffective communication may often subvert the intent of law and policy.

Sixth, anticipatory fears -- held by neighbors, colleagues, work group, the public -- often operate to prevent modification of discrimination. These fears may, of course, be real or rationalizations.

Uniting and reinforcing the mechanisms of discrimination is an ideology, which is invoked to justify the inferior status of the excluded group. It expresses beliefs about the inferiority of the minority and deals in stereotypes. Given some easily visible characteristic, such as color, language, or dress, the barriers tend to become more rigid and the ideology more intense. All perceptions tend to become distorted in the direction of justifying discriminatory behavior. Social patterns of discrimination do not invariably precede the formulation of such an ideology. Rather, the two reinforce one another. The stereotypes are often incorporated into everyday life: in literature (Uncle Tom's Cabin), in children's games and songs ("catch a nigger by the toe"), in the mass media (Amos and Andy, Aunt Jemima), in the Negro domestic, and in the prejudicial discourse of parents. The social result may be to prepare the child for discrimination in his adult roles. Where prejudice is not intense or immediate, where other reasons are compelling, we make individual exceptions -- "you're a white nigger" -- exceptions that actually do not upset systemic discrimination, but reinforce it. For by noting the exception, we affirm the generalization.

Perhaps the most insidious aspect of discrimination as an institution is its feedback character -- what has been called the self-fulfilling prophecy, or the principle of cumulation.[4] Discrimination vitiates the power and knowledge of its victims, so that they may often be unable to take advantage of the facilities and opportunities which do exist to combat it. It may lower their levels of aspiration and produce a degree of objective support for the original rationalizations. It would be an oversimplification to assume that this vicious circle encompasses all factors; for then we would expect discrimination to spread and harden into a caste system. Other factors modify these tendencies, but they negate neither the significance of the feedback nor its consequences.

The Functions of Discrimination

The word "function" may be used in various ways: On the one hand, it may refer to the motives of behavior; on the other, it refers to its consequences.[5] A complete analysis of discrimination can only be achieved if both its impelling reasons and its consequences are examined. Let us first consider the former.

---

[4] Gunnar Myrdal, An American Dilemma, New York: Harper, 1944, pp. 75-78; Robert K. Merton, "A Social Psychological Factor (The Self-Fulfilling Prophecy)," in Social Theory and Social Structure, Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1949.

Discrimination rests upon several motives, personal and social. First, there is the possibility of direct economic, social or political benefit through exploitation. The southern landowner who, as a member of the Board of Elections, prevents Negroes from voting and thus from exercising political power, may thereby achieve gain through rigged laws and judicial practices.

Second, there is the gain that derives from monopolistic control over desired values; for example, the union that restricts membership and thus gains economic advantage for its members.

Third, there is discrimination that is motivated by fear of loss, or negative profit. This rests upon the discriminator's presumption that he will be punished by failing to discriminate. The employer, the union official, the real estate broker, the admissions committee of a club or medical school, the employment agency, may or may not be prejudiced; but they discriminate because they assume that their economic or status interests will suffer if they do otherwise, since they believe themselves to be dependent upon a prejudiced work force, membership, body of alumni, clientele, or colleagues.

A fourth type of gain is that which, by pandering to prejudice, diverts hostility which might otherwise be directed against the discriminator. The employer who establishes himself as a "right guy" by discriminating in hiring or upgrading, by exploiting the prejudices of the labor force, may thereby divert attention from other grievances.

In all these cases, the discriminator benefits from the persistence of discriminatory policies. It should be noted, however, that once discrimination becomes institutionalized, it may be perpetuated even though its agent no longer receives any significant gain.

To these types of discrimination should be added the prejudice-motivated type. Here there is psychic gain for the discriminator independent of financial profit or avoidance of loss. The employer who doesn't hire a Negro, even though he may be the most competent candidate for the job, simply because he hates Negroes, may take a material loss, but his action provides him with a psychic satisfaction.

---

[5] Robert K. Merton, op. cit., Ch. 2, discusses the distinction between manifest and latent functions -- intended and unanticipated consequences -- at great length.

For discrimination to exist, one or another of these motives (which are not mutually exclusive) must be present under the conditions of scarcity, shared goals, and unequal power discussed earlier. Motivation without power is insufficient to effect discrimination. To understand the perpetuation of discrimination, however, it is useful to examine its "functions" in the sense of its consequences. There are those who are in no position to exercise, apply, or extend discriminatory practices, e. g. : the workers in a factory whose union does not have control of hiring and upgrading; poor whites in the South; landlords who own dwellings only in Negro sections; white Protestant applicants to medical school. Yet because discrimination benefits them, materially and psychically, they lend tacit support to discriminatory patterns. This is significant because, if sufficiently numerous, such beneficiaries promote a climate of opinion that strengthens the hold of discrimination and makes it all the more difficult to eradicate. One of the major questions for research lies precisely in determining who benefits from discrimination, and in what ways, among those who hold power and among those who do not.

What is often overlooked is that discrimination may also be functional for the victim. The Negro in America may in large measure be freed of one source of guilt; powerless, he need not share in the guilt of the powerful; a second-class citizen, he is relieved of full responsibility. With the road to advancement blocked or partially blocked, the victim of discrimination may not suffer the anxieties and frustrations, particularly for the many who fail, of being involved in the struggle to get ahead.[6] The Negro entrepreneur or professional may also benefit from discrimination, which gives him a captive market.[7]

Were discrimination unequivocally rewarding -- materially and psychically -- it would indeed be a Herculean task to eradicate it. Discriminatory social patterns, however, invariably have negative consequences not only for the victim but for the community, and even for the discriminators.

Obviously, discrimination has destructive consequences for its victims, though far more is known about its effects on the Negroes in the South than about its impact upon Negroes and other minority groups in the North. The cost of discrimination to the national community has,

---

[6] As the Elmira study (Ch. V) demonstrates, however, Negroes, subjected to the impact of mass media, as well as for other reasons, are hardly immune to mobility drives.

[7] See E. Franklin Frazier, Black Bourgeosie, New York: Free Press, 1957, for a discussion of the vested interest of the Negro middle class in segregation.

fortunately, received thorough analysis in the symposium edited by Professor MacIver[8] (though further documentation, particularly covering the nine years since the appearance of MacIver's volume, is needed). The tension it creates in the community is demonstrably destructive and wasteful; but we know little, even today, about its costs in terms of social disorganization, mental and physical illness, absenteeism, noncooperation with authority, and the like. Informed commentators have discussed the disastrous international implications of discrimination in the United States; others have called attention to the costs of discrimination to poor southern whites and to unorganized workers, two segments of the population often in ardent support of discrimination. A tight labor market has made segments of management sensitive to the waste of manpower in which discrimination results.[9] Discrimination as an institution is clearly less than successful, even judged by its own ends.

II. EQUALITY OF LIFE CHANCES

A Problem of Status

The central consequence of discrimination to its victims is a systematic, pervasive inequality in "life chances," the typical chances of the members of a social group for acquiring goods, external living conditions, and personal life experiences.[10] The rules of the game -- whatever the rules are in a given society -- do not apply to the member of an excluded group. He always bears the burden of being in this group, even if an occasional exception is made for the individual. This is what makes discrimination a problem of status rather than of welfare alone. For even were our society wealthy enough to assure a good living to all Negroes and Puerto Ricans, provide them with adequate houses, and other opportunities, their life chances would still be unequal. It is only when the individual is treated as an individual, with the same freedom of choice and equality of opportunity available to other individuals, that he achieves freedom from the consequences of a subordinate status.

---

[8] Robert M. MacIver, ed., Discrimination and National Welfare, New York: Harper, 1949.

[9] This is a central thesis of Eli Ginzburg, The Negro Potential, New York: Columbia University Press, 1956. Cf., the study of management attitudes (Ch. VI) in the present volume.

[10] The concept of "life chances" is that of Max Weber. See From Max Weber, New York: Oxford University Press, 1945, pp. 180-181.

Discrimination and Cultural Equipment

Discrimination (or its absence) is not the only factor involved in the operation of life chances. The life chances of the members of a minority group are also affected by their cultural equipment and environment. This includes such things as the opportunity to learn the language of their host culture; the capacity, in the light of their cultural background, to take advantage of existing opportunities; conceptions of time, "success," mobility, work, morality; their possession of appropriate skills, associations, and educational attainments. There is no doubt that cultural equipment plays a major role, over and above discrimination, in determining the life chances of Negro migrants from the South or of Puerto Rican in-migrants.

Cultural equipment played a similar role in the life of earlier immigrants to the United States. However, in due course, through the process of acculturation, the weight of the cultural baggage brought by immigrants and the cohesive pressure of the immigrant community dissolved. The immigrants -- or, more likely, their children and grandchildren -- became integrated into the American social structure and social class position became a more important factor than ethnic origin in determining life chances. The discrimination which immigrant groups encountered as "strangers" -- though it slowed the acculturation process -- tended to disintegrate in time, in the absence of distinguishing physical characteristics.

There are other interrelationships between discrimination and cultural equipment. On the one hand, language differences, varying value orientations, lack of contacts, and the like, may hamper the minority group in its ability to overcome discrimination. On the other hand, the opportunity to modify cultural equipment may be limited by past experience with discrimination.

Thus discrimination sometimesproduces a "reaction formation": Some of its victims retreat to the safety of the old culture and ghetto, abandoning efforts at overcoming the barriers to integration. This retreat may become a "return," a value in itself, and continue even after the barriers are removed. Since full participation in the larger society offers greater rewards, however, the breakdown of discriminination is ultimately decisive for most members of a minority group in the determination of their life chances.

Discrimination in the past may also have had more permanent consequences. To take advantage of existing opportunities youth must grow up in an environment which allows them to develop their individual potentialities, provides them with success models they can emulate, equips them with tools and skills, and enables them to develop the aspirations and self-confidence essential for maximum growth. Thus, for example, lack of self-esteem among Negroes that derives from long cultural and economic deprivation makes it difficult for many Negroes today to perform effectively tasks requiring self-confidence. The discrimination which has in the past militated against a stable Negro family environment makes it difficult for Negro children to acquire the benefits of family stability and parental encouragement.

The responsibility of a society committed to the values embodied in the American Creed -- particularly to the equality of life chances -- as well as the pragmatic desire to eliminate the troublesome social problems which arise from the existence of minority status, dictate the need for efforts to overcome the social and psychological effects of a long history of discrimination.

Discrimination and Low Incomes

The most direct expressions -- though not necessarily the most painful, particularly in times of prosperity -- of the unequal life chances imposed upon the victims of discrimination are seen in economic indices (see Chapter III) and in housing and health standards. In a society which has not succeeded in eradicating poverty, minority groups are likely to be disproportionately concentrated in the low-income brackets. This disproportion is not greatly narrowed by private and public welfare activities. Only the end of discriminatory barriers promises to resolve this inequality.

There is no necessary hard-and-fast relationship between discrimination and low incomes. In the first place, a group may be disproportionately poor because it occupies an immigrant status. The crucial question is: How rapidly does it overcome poverty? To what extent is its disadvantage maintained because of discrimination?

Second, discrimination may be largely limited to certain areas of life, e.g., social and public accommodations, which may have only a minimal effect on the persistence of poverty, undesirable as such discrimination may be on other grounds. While there is an indubitable connection between discrimination in resort areas and segregated schools, the latter are of far greater gravity and significance in perpetuating low-income status.

Third, an outcast group may come to fulfill a central function in the economy so that, though disliked, feared, and avoided, its income level is nevertheless high. This can result from two factors: the performance by the rejected group of important functions which are closed, on religious-cultural or status grounds, to the majority; and the exploitation by the group of hitherto undeveloped opportunities in the economy. To take advantage of the latter possibility -- of great importance in a dynamic and secular society -- minorities must develop inclinations and abilities which equip them to seek out and develop new avenues of employment in the economy.

In actual practice, however, discrimination in most cases tends to keep most of its victims at low income levels. It does so directly, in preventing adults from obtaining decent jobs and homes or chances for improving their skills and competence. It does so indirectly, as suggested above, in preventing the establishment of an environment for youth which equips them with the skills and courage necessary for exploiting educational and social opportunities. Moreover, the dead weight of history, of the attitude that "things have always been this way," tends to vitiate the desire and the attempts to ameliorate the condition.

Heretofore we have used "poverty" or "low incomes" in objective terms, referring to insufficient purchasing power to maintain a socially acceptable minimum standard of living. In America today a family is considered poor when it cannot purchase the food required for a healthy diet as defined by nutrition experts; cannot afford housing in good condition which has separate rooms for parents and adolescents of different sexes, and indoor toilet and plumbing facilities; has inadequate access to proper medical care, and so forth. The Subcommittee on Low-Income Families of the Congressional Joint Committee on the Economic Report has accepted the figure of $2000 annual family income (or $3000 for urban families) as a mark below which a family is considered poor.

This figure is subject to refinement. It can only be valid on the assumption that all people pay the same price for similar commodities, a manifestly untenable assumption where discrimination in housing, resorts, and so forth, exists. It implies a relatively rational pattern of expenditures. Obviously, the poverty-line figure must be adjusted to the number of people to be supported by a given income and to the number of people in a family who have to work to attain a given income.

There is also, however, the subjective aspect of poverty. We have in mind the image of the average American family as presented by mass media. The impact of these media -- projecting cultural, social, and material goals which many families, in good measure because of discrimination, cannot reach -- is to make these families feel poor. With this approach, one's conception of who is to be included in the low-income bracket would expand considerably.

One cannot, in other words, inculcate in a population the desire to have certain things, a given level of aspiration, and deny their poverty when their desires are not satisfied, simply because they surpass a relatively arbitrary income level. Inequality of life chances not only results in low levels of living; it also creates intense frustration and tension when -- assuming that the minority group has come to share the aspirations of the majority for a given standard of living -- this standard cannot be realized.

Mobility, "Success," Class, and Discrimination

In our vertically stratified democratic society, achieving what we have come to call the "American Dream" rests upon a particular concept of mobility and success. There are a few places available at the top of the economic, power, and prestige hierarchies. It is morally incumbent upon all of us to strive for the top positions in these hierarchies. Ideally, in this view, perfect competition would allow those in each generation who possessed the best combination of drive, talent, training, and luck to reach the top. (There are, of course, relative degrees of "moral perfection" or "success.") The educational system is geared to this system of values, and youngsters are urged and prepared to participate in the race for upward mobility.

If we accept this view of success uncritically, then we might also accept the idea that discrimination is simply an irrelevant element in the competition to get to the top. Those who see the problem in this light urge minority members to adopt middle-class goals, patterns, and values, and urge society at large to give them an equal chance at success.[11] Thus emphasis is directed toward securing admission to country clubs, high-priced housing areas, and executive and professional positions for the most "capable" (i.e., the most middle-class) minority group members.

This concept of success, though not wholly irrelevant to the central problem of discrimination and low incomes, in essence obscures its major dimensions. Success can have a completely different connotation, emphasizing the achievement of satisfying levels of living by everyone, rather than the high ascent of the few. The central problem for minorities would then be that of full participation in the life and problems of whatever social class they are in. Concretely this means acquisition of industrial skills, full rights of union membership, the procurement of education and training commensurate with ability, and access to moderate housing areas and white-collar and lower managerial positions. Abstractly it means a sense of their own dignity and worth at whatever social level they find themselves. In other words, the orientation becomes one of decency, comfort, security, stability, and dignity for the many. Once this is achieved, the few who are so motivated will -- as will some majority group members in their position -- still seek to attain middle- and upper-class status.

---

[11] There is no doubt that this conception of success presents a problem relevant to all youth in our society, and not only to minority youth.

The function of symbols and role models must also be considered. It is often contended that the apathy and lack of self-confidence characteristic of many minority group youngsters stems in part from a lack of adequate models as well as from an all-too-realistic appraisal of their life chances. These characteristics, in turn, tend to vitiate anti-discrimination efforts. Traditionally, the Jackie Robinsons, Ralph Bunches, and George Washington Carvers have been extolled as providing models whom Negro youngsters can emulate. Such men doubtless are -- and justly -- an important source of group pride. Moreover, they are unquestioned successes. But they are highly gifted men functioning in fields (athletics, science, and so forth) that are hospitable to talent -- but a kind of talent that is not possessed in quantity by either the majority or the minority. One might well question the relevance of such symbols to the overwhelming number of minority group youngsters. For all but a minute handful, aspirations based on such models are self-defeating. If, on the other hand, one's own father or other relatives have achieved security, respect, and satisfaction, or one can point with respect to the teacher, union official, successful artisan, or laboratory technician of one's own group, emulation becomes more meaningful, realistic, and feasible.

Moreover, there are further grounds for skepticism regarding the use of highly successful individuals as symbols in anti-discrimination efforts. All too often the exception is hailed as evidence of liberalism and promotes an unrealistic view of the status of the minority group as a whole. One must also inquire into the characteristics of certain types of minority group "success" models. Can we speak of discrimination having been overcome when a Negro engineer or sales supervisor or foreman occupies his position not simply because he is competent but because he is outstanding, is ingratiating, has no "chip on his shoulder," is extraordinarily polite, or is willing to accept responsible but non-supervisory positions? In other words, one who is not treated as any other individual, but who is rewarded not only because he has the requisite characteristics for the job or house but because, "knowing his place," he becomes accepted? Such success is often achieved at the cost of self-respect and dignity, extraordinary hard work, and the repression of characteristics which would be perfectly acceptable in majority group members. One may doubt the desirability and efficacy of this kind of success model.

III. THE BREAKDOWN OF DISCRIMINATION

Accommodation

Theoretically, one way to bring about the end of discrimination would be for the minority group to relinquish its claims and aspirations to equal opportunities in the struggle for life chances, i. e., to accommodate to a caste status. This is, in essence, what happened in part at the end of the nineteenth century in the North as well as in the South. A second alternative would be the establishment of a quota system: Such and such a percentage of a minority group may be admitted to the universities, managerial positions, and so forth. But the American culture continues to promote and reinforce the idea that access to material and psychic satisfactions are to be possessed and enjoyed by all the people. Moreover, the last decade and a half of nearly full employment and the possibility of geographic mobility have strengthened the demand for equality of opportunity. There is no longer any serious possibility that any minority will reject this expectation. (It seems equally obvious that a third alternative -- a biracial state or minority nationalism -- is no longer a possibility.)

When minority groups in a society reject caste or quasi-caste status, what are the factors that will advance or impede the breakdown of discrimination?

Minority Discontent

Minority discontent with discrimination is essential to this breakdown. Its effectiveness, however, requires a strength which, in turn, demands organization and leadership. The minority which transforms its aggression into self-hatred, which spends its energies in intra-minority strife and status-seeking, which fails to develop a competent leadership, and which neglects to involve the majority of its members in opposing discrimination -- thereby diminishes its potential power and resources. But even the most efficient mobilization of minority power is not sufficient to affect sweeping changes in social relations. Economic boycotts and political pressures by a minority act as gadflies and irritants, but not as decisive levers of social change. (This does not deny the importance of such action in enhancing the pride, solidarity, and self-esteem of the minority.)

General Environmental Factors

Social action directed against discrimination does not take place in a vacuum. Its success or failure is related to prevailing conditions and social developments. It would require extensive analysis to determine the conditions that would facilitate the breakdown of discrimination, but certain of these conditions are already evident.

We have noted the relationship between discrimination and the conflict over scarce values and goods. It is obvious that an economy of full employment and an expanding productive capacity lessens the pressure to discriminate. It does not, however, resolve discrimination in job upgrading; nor is it necessarily accompanied by an adequate housing supply. As we approach abundance, however, discrimination that results from conflict over the attainment of scarce values subsides.

Industrialization (of agriculture as well) likewise aids in the reduction of discrimination. This is true not only because industrialization achieves greater abundance but because it depends upon the rational and universal distribution of skills, resources, and purchasing power. Where there are formalized rules and regulations, where impersonal profit-making or efficiency guides conduct and decisions, then prejudice-motivated, irrational discrimination can more easily be attacked. Thus where upgrading is based on average competence and seniority rather than on personal factors, the minority group member experiences improved job and upgrading opportunities.

External threats to national security tend to modify internal conflict and increase solidarity, particularly with respect to full utilization of manpower. This factor may, however, be a double-edged sword: Does the hostility directed toward an external target necessarily diminish the amount of internal hostility? On the contrary, may not hostility once aroused be pervasive and non-selective, aiming at "enemies" inside as well as outside the state?

Somewhat more clearcut in its effects is the degree of existing tension in a society. The greater the general tension and frustration, the higher the anxiety level, the greater is the temptation to resort to discrimination.

Thus it would seem that anti-discrimination efforts must necessarily be allied with efforts to achieve an abundant, secure, and relaxed society.

The Value Context

We know that the most effective way of achieving any social behavior pattern, at least in a free society, is for consensus to underlie both the goals of the behavior and the means for its attainment. In other words, a successful anti-discrimination effort depends, in part, upon the existence of a unified climate of opinion. Fortunately, in our case, we possess an official, public commitment to democratic values. Every American school child is taught the precepts of democracy. Two gaps exist, however: that between goals and means; and that between belief and action. The current state of affairs points up the need to sharpen the awareness of this conflict of norms in the hearts of our citizens: to stress that in order to have full democracy, concrete equality of opportunity must be granted. This would, of course, intensify the guilt feelings of those who violate, even passively, democratic values. Some would react with greater bigotry, rejecting democratic goals. There are those, however, who would find it possible to relinquish discriminatory behavior, bringing means into accord with goals.

The first step is to get larger segments of the population to accept and commit themselves, formally and explicitly, to democratic goals and to the means by which they are attained. State law and statements of voluntary and corporate bodies are steps in this direction. The discriminator or supporter of discrimination must be made to feel increasingly isolated and anti-social. This is one important way of getting him to conform.

A law that is in conformity with accepted values has a good chance of being obeyed. Widespread publication of the existence of the law is a second step toward achieving a democratic climate of opinion.

Not all segments of the population, though, are equally important, since power is distributed unequally. Thus it is most essential that power groups in industry, labor, and public bodies accept and affirm their adherence to democratic tenets. As authorities, they can convince others; as power-wielders, they can help translate belief into action. For example union leadership, imbued with a democratic-humanitarian ideology, can go far to eradicate discrimination from its area of influence. (See Chapters VIII and IX.)

Guilt and the acceptance of a democratic ideology are not the only basis for adherence to equalitarian values. Moral suasion can be supplemented by pragmatic considerations. The taxpayer, the union organizer, the profit-seeking executive, the welfare worker, and others may be converted by reference to the high cost of discrimination.

Translating Values into Action

Conversion is not enough, however. Unless anti-discriminatory policies are made part and parcel of the way of doing things, and not dependent upon the good will and caprice of individuals, they are apt to be ineffective. Values must be embodied in policy and procedures, and policies supported by enforcement mechanisms and adequate personnel. Constant evaluation must be made of the effectiveness of anti-discrimination policies.

Making Discrimination "Uneconomic"

The notion that "crime does not pay" has yet to eradicate crime, no matter how harsh the punishment and how effective the policing powers, for the simple reason that crime is not always engaged in because one thinks it will pay. But discrimination often is. By making it uneconomic -- where union recognition is denied, where government contracts are not consummated, where no alternative housing exists, where fines and publicity are concentrated -- discrimination can be effectively combatted even prior to conversion to democratic values.

Other Possibilities for Action

Three other areas would seem to be relevant to the breakdown of discrimination. The first is related to the effects of past discrimination. We have noted that one of the consequences of discrimination lies in the measure of truth it gives to prejudice. An employer, ready to hire a member of a minority group, may not find one with adequate skills, for appropriate training has been denied in the past. Special efforts, then, must be devoted to such areas. This suggests that guidance, special help, and training of minority youth may pay off far more in terms of equality of life chances than a similar investment in a program focused on discrimination against adults. (The two are, of course, not mutually exclusive.) Central to this problem is the absence of success models for minority youth. If they cannot identify with their parents and relatives, who have been unsuccessful because of discrimination, society must make provision for identification with others of their own group.

The second area is related to the first. The breakdown of stereotypes is involved in the breakdown of discrimination, though one need not necessarily precede the other. Whatever truth past discrimination has given to the stereotype must be eradicated. Stereotypes -- irrational beliefs though they are -- can also be dealt with under certain conditions by the rational presentation of evidence to the contrary. Where no great stake in holding to the stereotype exists, where it is contradicted in interaction with minority group members under conditions of equality, where reason can operate -- stereotypes can be either eradicated or repressed. We should not belittle the latter possibility; most liberals, brought up in a discriminating society but brought to liberalism for various reasons, still retain their stereotypes and prejudices, but they do not act on them. This is a major gain in anti-discriminatory efforts. Perhaps the most effective way stereotypes can be overcome is in the development by minority group members of new identifications. When a Negro is seen as a union member, an actor, a member of a P-TA, a Methodist, or a neighbor, the observer looks at all Negroes with a less stereotyped view. Nonetheless, stereotypes are basically irrational; they remain even when exceptions are made, and cannot be expected to disappear prior to the disappearance of discrimination. This suggests the wastefulness of over-investment in anti-stereotypic education, particularly since discrimination is not primarily a psychological phenomenon.

Finally, we must see the struggle against discrimination as a long-term affair. Concomitant with it -- and relevant to the problem of life chances -- are efforts to by-pass discrimination. There are gaps waiting to be filled in our economy, as well as new areas of activity where discrimination has not yet set in. Taking advantage of these is the primary responsibility of minority group leadership. But the majority of the society which fostered discrimination has a responsibility to do its share in guiding its minorities to such potential areas of success.

We have, in this theoretical effort, tried to maintain a balance between consideration of the fundamental problem of discrimination, in whatever society it occurs, and of the urgent problem of discrimination in the state of New York. The attempt will have been successful only insofar as it both provokes further basic thinking and affords guidelines to action.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

WORKING TABLES* FOR CHAPTER III: "MINORITY GROUPS AND ECONOMIC STATUS IN NEW YORK STATE"

Tables included in the Appendix are, in some cases, referred to directly in the text of Chapter III. Others are included either as additional evidence for points there made or as supplementary material which may help the reader to round out the picture.

The reader will note that totals in one table may not exactly equal totals in another (e.g., Negroes in the state 14 years and over, Tables 1 and 21). This is due to the fact that Census data are often projections from different samples. Also, data are often presented for "Puerto Rican, Nonwhite and White" while, technically, the third category is "Continental White." For the sake of brevity, we have let the term "White" designate "Continental White."

The materials, though the most recent available, are for the most part _not_ current. Moreover, data from the New York City 1952 Survey have been included even though many demographers would point to the small numbers of minority group members included in the sample and the unreliabilities which thus result from sampling variation. Nevertheless, the data _in toto_ seem helpful and suggestive in terms of the questions raised in the text. Where necessary, qualifications for their interpretation have been made. This systematic presentation of New York data should provide a basis for comparison for subsequent studies.

The data on the economic status of minorities in New York should be read against the background of statistics presented for the country as a whole, for instance in Eli Ginzberg's _The Negro Potential_, New York: Columbia University Press, 1956 and the _Journal of Negro Education_, Vol. 22, Summer 1953.

---

*Prepared by Gladys Engel Lang, with the assistance of Arno Winard.

INDEX TO TABLES

Income

Table 1. Persons 14 Years and Over with Reported Income, by Race, New York State; and Puerto Ricans, New York City, 1950

Table 2. Median Income of Urban Families by Color, U.S., 1945-49

Table 3. Distribution of Persons with Income, by Color and Sex, U.S., 1954

Table 4. Median Wage and Salary Income in U.S. of Employed Persons, by Color, 1939, 1947-50, 1954

Table 5. Distribution of Persons 14 Years and Over Reporting Income, by Color and Sex, Northeastern Region, 1949 and 1954

Table 6. Income Distribution of Persons 14 Years and Over Reporting Income, U.S. Urban; N.Y.S. Urban and Rural Nonfarm; Buffalo; and Rochester, by Race, 1949

Table 7. Distribution of Persons 14 Years and Over Reporting Income, by Race and Sex, New York City, 1949

Table 8. Distribution of White, Negro, and Puerto Rican Persons 14 Years and Over Reporting Income, New York City, 1949

Table 9. Distribution of Income of Households, by Puerto Rican, Nonwhite, and White, New York City, 1952

Industry

Table 10. Cumulative Distribution of Income of Households, by Color and Occupation of Head of Household, New York City, 1952

Table 11. Industrial Distribution of Employed Persons, by Color, U.S.: Annual Averages, 1955, 1954, 1951, and 1948

Table 12. Industrial Distribution of Employed Persons 14 Years and Over, by Race and Sex, New York State, 1950

Table 13. Industrial Distribution of Puerto Ricans, Nonwhites, and Whites in Labor Force, by Sex, New York City, 1952

Table 14. Industrial Distribution of 553 Employed Puerto Ricans in New York City, 1948

Occupation
Table 15. Occupational Distribution of Employed Men, by Color, United States, 1940 and 1950

Table 16. Occupational Distribution of Employed Persons, by Color, United States: Annual Averages, 1955, 1954, 1951, and 1948

Table 17. Occupational Distribution of Employed Persons, 14 Years and Over, by Sex and Race, New York State, 1940 and 1950

Table 18. Occupational Distribution of Puerto Ricans, Nonwhites, and Whites, 14 Years and Over, by Sex, New York City, 1952

Table 19. Puerto Ricans, Whites, and Nonwhites of Given Age Groups in the Labor Force by Occupation, New York City, 1952

Table 20. Some Comparisons of Occupation Within Industry, New York City, 1952

Labor Force
Table 21. Employment Status of Persons 14 Years and Over, by Sex, New York State, 1950, for Whites, Negroes, and Puerto Ricans

Table 22. Persons 14 Years and Over Unemployed, by Sex and Group, New York State and New York City, 1949

Table 23. Analysis of Puerto Ricans, Nonwhites, and Whites Unemployed, New York City, 1952

Table 24. Labor Force Status of Married Women: Puerto Ricans, Nonwhites, and Whites, New York City, 1952

Housing
Table 25. Housing Conditions of Puerto Ricans, Nonwhites, and Whites, New York City, 1952

Table 26. Average Accommodations for White and Nonwhite Renter Households (Excluding Public Housing), Buffalo, April 1955

Education
Table 27. Years of Schooling Completed by Puerto Ricans, Nonwhites, and Whites, 15 Years and Over, by Sex, New York City, 1952

Table 28. Puerto Ricans, Whites, and Nonwhites Enrolled in School, New York City, 1952

Table 29. Education as a "Compounding" Factor

Population
Table 30. Components of Change in Population by Color, Buffalo, 1940-50 and 1950-55

Table 1. Persons 14 Years and Over with Reported Income, by Race, New York State; and Puerto Ricans, New York City, 1950

Group	Number in population	Number with income	Percentage with income
Total 14 years and over	11,589,095	6,768,200	58.4
White	10,846,255	6,316,485	58.2
Negro	711,070	433,350	60.9
Other races	31,770	18,365	57.8
Puerto Rican (NYC) [a]	216,830	123,335	56.9

[a] Figures not available for New York State.

Sources: U.S. Census of Population: 1950, Vol. II, P-C32, New York, Table 87; Vol. IV, Special Reports, P-E No. 3D, Puerto Ricans in Continental United States, Table 4.

Table 2. Median Income of Urban Families by Color, U.S., 1945-49

Year	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite as a Percentage of White
1949	$2084	$3619	57.6
1948	2172	3694	58.8
1947	1963	3465	56.7
1946	1929	3246	59.4
1945	2052	3085	66.5

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Negroes in the United States: Their Employment and Economic Status, Bulletin No. 1119, Table 23.

Table 3. Distribution of Persons with Income, by Color and Sex, U.S., 1954
(percentage)

Income	Male		Female	
	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite
Less than $500	8.6	19.3	24.6	39.6
$500-$999	8.2	14.9	19.0	25.9
$1,000-$1,499	6.8	12.2	11.0	12.5
$1,500-$1,999	6.1	10.1	10.4	8.8
$2,000-$2,499	6.4	9.8	10.4	5.3
$2,500-$2,999	7.3	8.9	7.7	2.2
Less than $2,000	29.7	56.5	65.0	86.8
Less than $3,000	43.4	75.2	83.1	94.3
$3,000 and over	56.6	24.8	16.9	5.7
Median Income (dollars)	$3,359	$1,678	$1,291	$701

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports - Consumer Income, Series P-60, No. 19 (Oct. 1955), Table 8.

Table 4. Median Wage and Salary Income in U.S. of Employed Persons, by Color, 1939, 1947-50, 1954

Year	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite as a Percentage of White
1954	$1589	$3174	50.1
1950	1295	2481	52.2
1949	1064	2350	45.3
1948	1210	2323	52.1
1947	863	1980	43.6
1939	364	956	38.1

Sources: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Negroes in The United States: Their Employment and Economic Status, Bulletin No. 1119, Table 24; U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports - Consumer Income, Series P-60, No. 19 (Oct. 1955), Table 11.

Table 5. Distribution of Persons 14 Years and Over Reporting Income, by Color and Sex, Northeastern Region, 1949 and 1954
(percentage)

Income	1949				1954			
	Male		Female		Male		Female	
	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite
Less than $999	14.2	19.3	38.4	42.3	12.0	16.5	37.1	39.7
$1000 to $1,999	15.9	28.5	29.8	40.1	11.2	18.7	23.3	36.7
$2,000 to $2,999	26.3	36.4	21.8	14.1	15.0	22.8	22.3	12.4
Less than $2,000	30.1	47.8	68.2	82.9	23.2	35.2	60.4	76.4
Less than $3,000	56.4	84.2	90.0	97.0	38.2	58.0	82.7	88.8
$3,000 and over	43.6	15.8	10.0	3.0	61.8	42.0	17.3	11.2
Median Income (dollars)	$2,759	$2,054	$1,407	$1,165	$3,496	$2,730	$1,584	$1,236

Sources: 1949 Data, U.S. Census of Population: 1950, Vol. II, PC-1, U.S. Summary, Table 162; 1954 Data, U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports -- Consumer Income, Series P-60, No. 19 (Oct. 1955), Table 8; 1949 median income taken from Herman P. Miller, Income of the American People, New York: Wiley, 1955, p. 42, Table 16.

Table 6. Income Distribution of Persons 14 Years and Over Reporting Income, U.S. Urban; N.Y.S. Urban and Rural Nonfarm; Buffalo; and Rochester, by Race, 1949
(percentage)

Income	U. S. Urban		N.Y.S. Urban & Rural Nonfarm			Buffalo		Rochester	
	White	Nonwhite	White	Negro	Other races	White	Negro	White	Negro
Total Number	41,655,485	4,550,300	6,095,125	432,175	17,990	254,370	16,315	158,100	3,535
Less than $500	13.2	21.4	10.4	10.7	10.2	11.8	13.3	10.6	13.6
$500 to $999	10.9	20.2	9.3	15.6	13.0	9.8	15.4	9.6	14.7
$1,000 to $1,499	9.4	15.8	9.0	16.7	16.3	9.4	13.4	9.0	16.7
$1,500 to $1,999	9.8	13.8	10.2	18.5	17.4	9.5	10.9	10.8	16.1
$2,000 to $2,499	12.0	12.6	13.1	17.7	17.5	11.8	14.9	14.2	16.4
$2,500 to $2,999	10.3	7.6	11.4	10.0	9.1	12.7	15.4	12.6	11.3
Less than $2,000	43.3	71.2	38.9	61.5	56.9	40.5	53.0	40.0	61.1
Less than $3,000	65.6	91.4	63.4	89.2	83.5	65.0	83.3	66.8	88.8
$3,000 and over	34.4	8.6	36.6	10.8	16.5	35.0	16.7	33.2	11.2
Median Income (dollars)	$2,278	$1,263	$2,428	$1,690	$1,801	$2,402	$1,862	$2,353	$1,656

Sources: U.S. Census of Population: 1950, Vol. II, P-C1, U.S. Summary, Table 138; Vol. IV, P-E No. 3B, Nonwhite Population by Race, Table 9 (for U.S. Negro urban and rural nonfarm data); Vol. II, P-C32, New York, Table 87.

Table 7. Distribution of Persons 14 Years and Over Reporting Income, by Race and Sex, New York City, 1949
(percentage)

Income	Male		Female	
	White	Negro	White	Negro
Total Number	2,169,955	187,895	1,168,140	170,480
Less than $500	4.8	6.2	13.0	13.8
$500-$999	6.1	10.1	13.5	21.4
$1,000-$1,499	6.6	12.2	12.7	21.9
$1,500-$1,999	7.8	17.1	15.6	21.5
$2,000-$2,499	11.9	12.7	17.7	13.4
$2,500-$2,999	12.3	14.6	10.9	4.5
Less than $2,000	25.3	45.6	54.8	78.6
Less than $3,000	49.5	72.9	83.4	96.5
$3,000 and over	50.5	27.1	16.6	3.5
Median Income (dollars)	$3,017	$2,099	$1,844	$1,339

Source: U.S. Census of Population: 1950, Vol. II, P-C32, New York, Table 87.

Table 8. Distribution of White, Negro, and Puerto Rican Persons 14 Years and Over Reporting Income, New York City, 1949 (percentage)

Income	White	Negro	Puerto Rican	
			White	Nonwhite
Total Number	3,338,095	358,375	94,475	7,590
Less than $500	7.7	9.8	9.6	11.0
$500 to $999	8.7	15.5	15.0	17.8
$1,000 to $1,499	8.7	16.8	18.3	20.7
$1,500 to $1,999	10.6	19.2	22.4	19.7
$2,000 to $2,499	13.9	18.2	17.9	17.0
$2,500 to $2,999	11.8	9.8	7.8	7.4
Less than $2,000	35.7	61.3	65.3	69.2
Less than $3,000	61.4	89.3	91.0	93.6
$3,000 and over	38.6	10.7	9.0	6.4
Median Income (dollars)	$2,517	$1,707	$1,657	$1,513

Sources: U.S. Census of Population: 1950, Vol II, P-C32, New York, Table 87; Vol. IV. Special Reports, P-E No. 3D, Puerto Ricans in Continental United States, Table 5.

Table 9. Distribution of Income of Households, by Puerto Rican, Nonwhite, and White, New York City, 1952[a]
(percentage)

Income	With Given Income		
	Puerto Rican	Nonwhite	White
$2,000 or under	30.6	26.8	12.6
$2,001-$3,000	35.2	32.4	15.6
$3,001-$4,000	15.3	20.8	25.9
$4,001-$5,000	8.2	13.4	19.0
$5,001-$6,500	3.5	5.3	12.7
$6,501-$8,000	5.9	1.1	6.9
$8,001 and over	1.2	.4	7.3
Median income (dollars)	$2,760	$2,840	$3,980

[a] Does not include households for which no information on income was given. Households classified by race and nativity of head.

Source: New York City 1952 Survey.

Table 10. Cumulative Distribution of Income of Households by Color and Occupation of Head of Household, New York City, 1952 [a]
(percentage)

Cumulative Income	Nonwhite	White
A. Craftsmen, Foremen, Operatives and Laborers [b]		
$2000 or less	18.6	4.9
$3000 or less	50.8	18.2
$5000 or less	80.7	66.4
Unknown	13.7	15.2
Total number	124	1275
B. Clerical and Sales		
$2000 or less	2.2	5.6
$3000 or less	19.6	21.2
$5000 or less	69.6	60.8
Unknown	21.7	19.0
Total number	46	553
C. Service Other than Domestic		
$2000 or less	16.7	16.7
$3000 or less	40.9	40.0
$5000 or less	66.7	78.1
Unknown	27.3	14.1
Total number	66	270
D. Professional and Semiprofessional		
$2000 or less	4.0	2.3
$3000 or less	32.0	6.8
$5000 or less	60.0	34.7
Unknown	28.0	24.7
Total number	25	353

[a] Numbers of Puerto Ricans were too few to be included in this breakdown.

[b] All manual workers were grouped together in the survey.

Source: New York City 1952 Survey.

Table 11. Industrial Distribution of Employed Persons, by Color, U.S.: Annual Averages, 1955, 1954, 1951, and 1948

(percentage)

Industry	White				Nonwhite			
	1955	1954	1951	1948	1955	1954	1951	1948
Total employed	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Agriculture	10.1	10.1	10.8	12.6	15.7	15.5	18.7	21.1
Forestry, fisheries, and mining	1.4	1.3	1.6	1.5	0.7	0.8	2.4	3.0
Construction	6.5	6.4	6.5	6.0	5.3	5.5	5.2	4.5
Manufacturing	28.2	28.6	28.4	28.5	19.7	19.7	19.2	18.9
Transportation, communications, and other public utilities	7.4	7.6	8.0	8.3	6.0	6.5	5.8	6.4
Wholesale and retail trade	20.2	20.5	20.5	20.1	13.5	14.0	11.9	11.5
Private households	2.2	1.9	2.0	1.7	16.3	15.1	17.3	16.1
Personal services, except private household	2.8	2.8	3.0	3.2	6.5	6.1	6.0	6.6
Educational services	4.0	4.0	3.2	2.8	3.0	3.3	2.2	2.1
Professional and related services, except education	5.3	5.1	4.7	3.9	4.9	5.1	4.2	3.3
Service industries, except personal and professional [a]	7.3	7.2	6.5	6.8	4.0	3.9	3.5	3.3
Public administration	4.6	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.2	4.5	3.7	3.3

[a] Includes finance, insurance, and real estate; business and repair services; and entertainment and recreation services.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Report - Labor Force, Series P-50, No. 66 (March 1956) Table 4.

6

Table 12. Industrial Distribution of Employed Persons 14 Years and Over, by Race and Sex, New York State, 1950
(percentage)

Industry		Male		Female	
		White	Negro	White	Negro
Agriculture		4.1	0.9	0.8	0.2
Forestry and fisheries		0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mining		0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
Construction		7.4	6.3	0.6	0.2
Manufacturing:	durable goods	15.1	11.5	8.9	5.9
	nondurable goods	14.4	11.8	21.7	19.2
	other	0.3	0.9	0.3	0.9
Transportation, communication, other utilities		10.4	15.0	5.0	1.7
Trade		21.8	17.0	20.5	7.4
Finance, insurance, real estate		5.1	6.8	7.4	1.9
Business and repair services		3.5	4.2	2.0	0.5
Personal services		3.5	9.5	9.0	46.5
Entertainment, recreation services		1.3	1.8	1.2	0.5
Public administration		5.2	6.4	3.0	2.7
Professional services		6.3	5.7	17.4	10.7
Not reported		1.3	2.2	2.2	1.7
Number		3,874,665	209,540	1,672,425	169,757

Source: U.S. Census of Population: 1950, Vol. II, P-C32, New York, Table 83.

Table 13. Industrial Distribution of Puerto Ricans, Nonwhites, and Whites in Labor Force, by Sex, New York City, 1952

(percentage)

Industry	Male and Female			Male			Female		
	Puerto Rican	Nonwhite	White	Puerto Rican	Nonwhite	White	Puerto Rican	Nonwhite	White
Total Number	172	568	4895	101	312	3456	71	256	1439
Construction	2.3	1.9	4.8	4.0	3.5	6.6	-	-	.3
Manufacturing	38.9	22.9	23.8	23.8	18.3	22.5	60.6	28.5	26.9
Transportation, communication, & public utilities	6.4	6.9	9.3	9.9	11.9	11.1	1.4	.8	5.0
Wholesale and retail trades	19.1	9.3	19.4	23.8	12.2	20.1	12.7	5.8	17.6
Finance, insurance, real estate, & service	17.4	37.0	23.2	18.8	28.2	19.5	15.5	47.6	32.0
Government, not elsewhere classified	1.7	5.8	4.0	2.0	7.7	4.9	-	3.5	1.9
Other	-	.2	.2	-	.3	.3	-	-	-
Unknown	13.9	16.0	15.2	16.8	18.0	14.8	10.0	13.7	16.3

Source: New York City 1952 Survey.

Table 14. Industrial Distribution of 553 [a] Employed Puerto Ricans in New York City, 1948
(percentage)

Industrial group	Employed Puerto Ricans
Manufacturing and processing	56.0
Service trades and domestic service	32.0
Retail and wholesale trades	3.0
Transportation and shipping	3.0
Professional service	3.0
Government and military	3.0
Total Number	553

[a] Based on representative sample.

Source: Adapted from C. Wright Mills, Clarence Senior, and Rose Kohn Goldsen, The Puerto Rican Journey, New York: Harper, 1950, p.189.

Table 15. Occupational Distribution of Employed Men, by Color, United States, 1940 and 1950
(percentage)

Occupation	Nonwhite		White	
	1940	1950	1940	1950
Total employed	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Professional and technical, etc.	1.9	2.2	6.6	7.9
Farmers and farm managers	21.1	13.5	14.2	10.5
Proprietors, managers, and officials, except farm	1.6	2.0	10.6	11.6
Clerks, etc.	1.2	3.4	6.5	6.8
Salespeople	1.0	1.5	6.8	6.6
Skilled workers and foremen	4.4	7.6	15.9	19.3
Semiskilled and kindred workers	12.4	20.8	18.7	20.0
Household service workers	2.3	.8	.1	.1
Service workers, except household	12.3	12.5	5.2	4.9
Farm laborers	20.0	11.3	7.0	4.4
Laborers, except farm and mine	21.3	23.1	7.6	6.6
Occupation not reported	.6	1.3	.7	1.2

Source: Economic Forces in the U.S.A. in Facts and Figures, prepared by U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, in cooperation with International Cooperation Administration, Washington, D.C., June 1955, p.73.

Table 16. Occupational Distribution of Employed Persons, by Color, United States: Annual Averages, 1955, 1954, 1951, and 1948 [a]

(percentage)

Occupation	White				Nonwhite			
	1955	1954	1951	1948	1955	1954	1951	1948
Total employed	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Professional, technical, and kindred	9.8	9.8	8.4	7.2	3.5	3.7	3.2	2.4
Farmers and farm operators	6.0	6.4	6.6	7.8	5.0	5.8	6.9	8.5
Managers, officials, and proprietors, except farm	11.1	11.1	11.1	11.6	2.3	2.1	2.1	2.3
Clerical and kindred	14.2	14.3	13.6	13.6	4.9	5.0	3.5	3.3
Sales	6.9	7.0	6.7	6.7	1.3	1.5	0.9	1.1
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred	14.1	14.6	14.8	14.6	5.2	5.0	4.8	5.3
Operatives and kindred	20.2	20.0	20.9	21.0	20.9	20.5	19.3	20.1
Private household	1.8	1.6	1.7	1.5	14.8	14.3	15.9	15.6
Service, except private household	7.2	7.1	6.8	6.4	16.8	17.0	15.4	14.7
Farm laborers and foremen	3.9	3.5	4.0	4.6	9.5	9.3	11.2	12.5
Laborers, except farm and mine	4.7	4.8	5.4	4.9	15.8	15.7	16.7	14.3

[a] Annual averages based on data for four quarterly months: January, April, July, and October. Occupation data not tabulated in other months.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports - Labor Force, Series P-50, No.66 (March 1956) Table 3.

Table 17. Occupational Distribution of Employed Persons, 14 Years and Over, by Sex and Race, New York State, 1940 and 1950

(percentage)

Occupation	Male				Female			
	White		Negro		White		Negro	
	1940	1950	1940	1950	1940	1950	1940	1950
Professional, technical, kindred	7.8	10.1	3.5	3.2	13.8	13.2	3.5	4.9
Farmers and farm managers	3.4	2.4	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.2	-	-
Managers, proprietors, officials, non-farm	12.8	14.5	4.5	4.6	3.6	4.4	0.8	1.1
Clerical, sales, kindred	19.3	17.4	9.1	12.2	35.9	42.1	2.7	9.7
Craftsmen, foremen, kindred	17.1	19.7	7.8	10.6	1.3	1.9	0.3	1.3
Operatives, kindred	19.7	19.4	19.5	26.1	21.9	22.3	13.5	30.6
Private household	0.3	0.1	4.2	1.6	10.6	4.2	67.9	35.6
Service, except private household	9.6	8.1	34.0	23.4	10.5	9.3	10.3	14.3
Farm laborers and foremen	2.3	1.4	1.1	0.7	0.2	0.5	-	0.2
Laborers, except farm and mine	6.8	5.9	15.4	15.8	0.6	0.5	0.3	1.0
Occupation not reported	0.9	1.0	0.8	1.7	1.3	1.4	0.7	1.3
Total Number	3,399,906	3,874,665	108,587	209,540	1,352,546	1,672,425	99,839	169,757

Sources: 1940 Data, U.S. Census of Population: 1940, Vol. III, The Labor Force - New York, Table 13; 1950 Data, U.S. Census of Population: 1950, Vol. II, PC-32 New York, Table 77, pp. 326 ff.

Table 18. Occupational Distribution of Puerto Ricans, Nonwhites and Whites, 14 Years and Over, by Sex, New York City, 1952

Occupation	Puerto Rican		Nonwhite		White	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
			A. Male			
Not in Labor Force	14	12.2	59	15.9	665	16.1
Professional & semi-professional	1	.9	25	6.7	386	9.4
Managers, proprietors, etc.	7	6.1	17	4.6	528	12.8
Clerical, sales, kindred	5	4.3	48	12.9	643	15.6
Craftsmen, foremen, kindred	49	42.6	131	35.3	1,459	35.4
Domestic service	--	--	1	.3	1	.1
Other service	26	22.6	64	17.3	285	6.9
Unknown	13	11.3	26	7.0	154	3.7
Total	115	100.0	371	100.0	4,121	100.0
			B. Female			
Not in Labor Force	101	58.7	342	57.3	3,260	69.4
Professional & semi-professional	2	1.2	25	4.2	127	2.7
Managers, proprietors, etc.	--	--	2	.3	84	1.8
Clerical, sales, kindred	3	1.7	34	5.7	721	15.4
Craftsmen, foremen, kindred	45	26.2	84	14.1	315	6.7
Domestic service	1	.6	40	6.7	24	.5
Other service	14	8.1	44	7.4	94	2.0
Unknown	6	3.5	26	4.3	70	1.5
Total	172	100.0	597	100.0	4,695	100.0

Source: New York City 1952 Survey.

Table 19. Puerto Ricans, Whites, and Nonwhites of Given Age Groups in the Labor Force by Occupation, New York City, 1952

Age and Group	Total	Professional, Semiprofessional	Proprietors, etc.	Clerical, Sales	Craftsmen, etc.	Domestic Service	Other Service	Unknown
	No.	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
15-29:								
White	1243	10.4	6.3	44.5	27.8	0.2	4.9	5.8
Nonwhite	141	5.0	--	21.3	47.5	5.0	9.2	12.1
Puerto Rican	76	1.3	2.6	5.3	53.9	--	18.4	18.4
30-44:								
White	1642	10.5	13.4	25.5	39.2	0.1	7.0	4.3
Nonwhite	203	9.4	4.4	12.3	45.3	5.9	18.2	4.4
Puerto Rican	58	3.4	6.9	6.9	58.6	1.7	17.0	5.2
45-54:								
White	1016	11.4	17.8	18.7	39.0	0.6	10.6	1.9
Nonwhite	113	14.2	3.5	14.2	31.0	7.1	26.5	3.5
Puerto Rican	28	--	3.6	--	42.9	--	50.0	3.6
55-64:								
White	582	9.9	15.5	15.3	45.3	0.4	9.4	4.1
Nonwhite	44	2.3	9.1	9.1	31.8	4.5	36.4	6.8
Puerto Rican	5	--	--	--	60.0	--	20.0	20.0
65 & Over:								
White	204	6.9	11.8	17.6	43.6	2.9	14.2	2.9
Nonwhite	12	25.0	8.3	33.3	--	8.3	16.7	8.3
Puerto Rican [a]	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Unknown:								
White	224	11.6	9.8	35.7	18.7	3.1	5.8	15.2
Nonwhite	54	7.4	1.9	5.6	13.0	20.4	18.5	33.3
Puerto Rican [a]	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

[a] Number too small to analyze.

Source: New York City 1952 Survey.

Table 20. Some Comparisons of Occupation Within Industry, New York City, 1952

Occupation	A. Manufacturing [a]						B. Finance, Insurance, Real Estate, and Service Trades [b]					
	Male and Female						Male					
	White		Nonwhite		Puerto Rican		White		Nonwhite		Puerto Rican	
Total	No. 1,167	% 100.0	No. 130	% 100.0	No. 67	% 100.0	No. 675	% 100.0	No. 88	% 100.0	No. 19	% 100.0
Professional	57	4.9	3	2.3	--	--	204	30.2	18	20.4	1	5.3
Proprietors, officials, etc.	107	9.2	--	--	1	1.5	114	16.9	13	14.8	2	10.5
Clerical and sales	169	14.5	3	2.3	1	1.5	107	15.9	7	8.0	--	--
Manual workers	814	69.7	116	89.2	65	97.0	114	16.9	22	25.0	4	21.0
Other service	8	.7	4	3.1	--	--	117	17.3	28	31.8	--	--
Unknown	12	1.0	4	3.1	--	--	19	2.8	--	--	12	63.2

[a] Of the totals in the labor force 23.8% of whites, 22.9% of nonwhites, and 38.9% of the Puerto Ricans were employed in manufacturing.

[b] Of the totals in the male labor force 19.5% of the white males, 28.2% of the nonwhite males, and 18.8% of the Puerto Rican males were employed in the above industry groups.

Source: New York City 1952 Survey.

Table 21. Employment Status of Persons 14 Years and Over, by Sex, New York State, 1950, for Whites, Negroes, and Puerto Ricans

Group and Sex	New York State				New York City			
	Total	In Labor Force			Total	In Labor Force		
		Total	Employed	Unemployed		Total	Employed	Unemployed
Males:	No.	%	%	%	No.	%	%	%
White	5,207,900	78.8	93.8	6.2	2,743,820	79.7	92.7	7.3
Negro	320,514	74.6	88.2	11.8	269,855[b]	76.6	88.2	11.8
Puerto Rican	a	a	a	a	79,505	76.3	83.4	16.6
Females:								
White	5,638,355	31.2	95.0	5.0	2,975,470	33.1	94.7	5.3
Negro	391,290	47.3	91.8	8.2	332,970[b]	47.6	91.5	8.5
Puerto Rican	a	a	a	a	96,895	40.4	89.4	10.6

[a] Not available.

[b] Nonwhite.

Sources: U.S. Census of population: 1950, Vol. II, P-C32, New York, Table 66; Vol. IV, P-E, No. 3B, Nonwhite Population by Race, Table 20; Vol. IV, P-E, No. 3D, Puerto Ricans in Continental United States, Table 5.

Table 22. Persons 14 Years and Over Unemployed, by Sex and Group, New York State and New York City, 1949
(percentage)

New York State			New York City		
Male	White	6.2	Male	White	7.3
	Negro	11.8		Nonwhite	11.8
Female	White	5.0		Puerto Rican	16.6
	Negro	8.2	Female	White	5.3
				Nonwhite	8.5
				Puerto Rican	10.6

Sources: U.S. Census of Population: 1950, Vol. II, P-C32, New York, Table 66; Vol. IV, P-E, No. 3B, Nonwhite Population by Race, Table 20; Vol. IV, P-E, No. 3D, Puerto Ricans in Continental United States, Table 5.

Table 23. Analysis of Puerto Ricans, Nonwhites, Whites, and Unemployed, New York City, 1952

Employment Status	Total	Puerto Ricans	Nonwhites	Whites
Number known to be in labor force	5,635	172	568	4,895
Percentage of known labor force	100.	3.	10.	87.
Number known to be "looking for work" at time of survey, 1952	248	23	34	191
Percentage of those in labor force "looking for work"	4.	13.	6.	4.
Percentage of total employed as craftsmen, foremen, operatives and laborers	100.	5.	10.	85.
Percentage of craftsmen, etc. "looking for work"	100.	7.	14.	79.
Percentage of total females in labor force	100.	4.	15.	81.
Percentage of females "looking for work"	100.	4.	10.	85.
Percentage of total males in labor force	100.	3.	8.	89.
Percentage of males "looking for work"	100.	11.	15.	74.
Percentage of those in labor force with 8 years or less of school completed	100.	6.	13.	81.
Percentage of those in labor force with 8 years of school or less "looking for work"	100.	17.	16.	67.

Source: New York City 1952 Survey.

Table 24. Labor Force Status of Married Women: Puerto Ricans, Nonwhites, and Whites, New York City, 1952

Group	Total Over 14	Ever Married		Married, Spouse Present	
		Total	In Labor Force	Total	In Labor Force
	No.	No.	%	No.	%
Puerto Ricans	165	132	30.3	98	29.6
Nonwhites	545	439	38.7	269	32.7
Whites	4,492	3,693	20.3	3,005	17.4

Source: New York City 1952 Survey.

Table 25. Housing Conditions of Puerto Ricans, Nonwhites, and Whites, New York City, 1952
(percentage)

Accommodations	Puerto Ricans	Nonwhite	White
Total Number of Persons	103	395	3693
Number of sleeping rooms:			
1	28.2	26.1	31.3
2	36.9	39.2	44.1
3	26.2	23.5	18.9
4	8.7	6.8	4.0
5 and over	-	1.5	1.8
No information	-	2.8	.7
Number living in household:			
1	1.9	11.1	9.5
2	18.4	23.3	28.1
3	22.3	22.3	24.8
4	18.4	16.2	21.4
5	20.4	12.4	9.9
6	11.8	5.1	3.9
7	3.9	2.3	1.2
8	1.0	1.5	.6
9	-	2.0	.2
10 and over	1.9	3.8	.3
Toilet:			
Shared	15.5	14.7	5.8
Not shared	84.5	82.0	93.0
No information	-	3.3	1.2
Central Heat:			
Yes	82.5	79.2	87.9
No	12.6	15.2	8.3
No information	4.9	5.6	3.8
Household Composition:			
One person	-	11.1	6.9
Husband & wife	20.4	14.9	20.7
Husband-wife & child or children under 18	34.0	26.1	43.5
1 parent (or parent substitute) with children under 18	20.4	8.4	2.7
Parents with children over 18	10.7	6.3	10.6
Two or more families, children under 18 [a]	2.9	5.6	2.7
Two or more families, no children under 18	2.9	1.3	1.0
All other groups [a]	-	24.1	11.3
No information	8.7	2.3	.8

[a] Includes families with lodgers.

Source: New York City 1952 Survey.

Table 26. Average Accommodations for White and Nonwhite Renter Households (Excluding Public Housing), Buffalo, April 1955

Accommodations	White Households			Nonwhite Households		
	Under $3000	$3000-4999	$5000 & over	Under $3000	$3000-4999	$5000 & over
Average persons per room (*No*.)	.51	.64	.65	.77	.81	.82
Average persons per household (*No*.)	2.2	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.9	4.5
Average rooms (*No*.)	4.3	5.0	5.1	4.4	4.8	5.5
Units sub-standard (*%*)	18.0	14.0	10.0	55.0	39.0	24.0

Source: New York Temporary State Housing Rent Commission, *People, Housing and Rent Control in Buffalo*, April 1956, Table 18, p.48.

Table 27. Years of Schooling Completed by Puerto Ricans, Nonwhites, and Whites, 15 Years and Over, by Sex, New York City, 1952 (percentage)

Years of Schooling Completed	Puerto Ricans			Nonwhites			Whites		
	Male	Female	Both	Male	Female	Both	Male	Female	Both
Total Number	115	172	287	371	597	968	412	4695	8816
5 or less	18.2	30.8	25.8	13.2	11.2	11.9	7.3	9.4	8.4
6 - 8	40.8	30.2	34.4	27.5	26.8	27.0	26.3	25.9	26.0
9 - 12	29.5	30.2	29.9	32.7	42.4	38.5	41.4	48.3	44.9
Over 12	6.1	4.1	4.9	11.6	7.7	9.2	19.8	12.4	15.8
No information	5.2	4.6	4.9	15.1	11.9	13.1	5.3	4.0	4.6

Source: New York City 1952 Survey.

Table 28. Puerto Ricans, Whites, and Nonwhites Enrolled in School, New York City, 1952 [a]

Group	14 Years and Under		29 Years and Under	
	Total	Enrolled in School	Total	Enrolled in School
	No.	%	No.	%
Puerto Ricans	132	11.4	260	5.8
Nonwhites	453	18.3	737	11.3
Whites	2,902	22.0	5,136	12.4

[a] The percentages among all groups of persons enrolled in school appear to be unduly small. It may be that in the code made available to us some children "going to school" and also working are categorized as "working." There is no classification of children "going to school and also working."

Source: New York City, 1952 Survey. Cf., Fact Book on Children in New York City, published by the Community Council of Greater New York, 1957, for comparable data.

Table 29. Education as a "Compounding" Factor

	Puerto Rican	Nonwhite	White
Total in labor force (No.) [a]	172	568	4895
In "white-collar" jobs (No.)	18	151	2489
In "white-collar" jobs (%)	10.5	26.6	50.8
In labor force with 8 years or less of schooling (No.)	98	236	1450
In "white-collar" jobs (No.)	10	37	383
In "white-collar" jobs (%)	10.2	15.7	26.4
In labor force with 9 years or more of schooling (No.)	73	259	3235
In "white-collar" jobs (No.)	8	100	2051
In "white-collar" jobs (%)	11.0	38.6	63.4

[a] Includes those concerning whose educational attainments there is no information.

Source: New York City 1952 Survey.

Table 30. Components of Change in Population by Color, Buffalo, 1940-50 and 1950-55

Group	1940-50			1950-55 [a]		
	Total Change	Natural Increase	Net Migration	Total Change	Natural Increase	Net Migration
Total	4,231	43,663	-39,432	1,375	29,550	-28,175
White	-15,348	37,984	-53,332	-13,300	24,350	-37,650
Nonwhite	19,575	5,679	13,900	14,675	5,200	9,475

[a] Figures are rounded to nearest 25.

Source: New York Temporary State Housing Rent Commission, People, Housing and Rent Control in Buffalo, April 1956, Table XVIII, p.98.

APPENDIX B
QUESTIONNAIRE USED FOR CHAPTER V: "NEGRO AND WHITE HIGH SCHOOL YOUTH IN ELMIRA"

CARD 1

Background

4. Sex
5. Color
6. What is your date of birth?
7. Where were you born?
8. In what cities have you ever lived 5 years or more?
9. In what city did your mother mostly live as a girl (up to 15 years of age)?
10. In what city did your father mostly live as a boy (up to 15 years of age)?
11. Who else lives in your home now?
13. Is your mother (father, parents) living?
15. Do you mind telling me how old you were when your mother died? (if dead)
16. Do you mind telling me where your mother is living? (if alive but not at home)
17. (If mother is alive but living elsewhere): About how old were you when your mother left home?
18. (If father is dead): Do you mind telling me how old you were when your father died?
19. (If father is alive but living elsewhere): Do you mind telling me where your father is living?
20. (If father is alive but living elsewhere): About how old were you when your father left home?
21. (If mother is dead or elsewhere): Who took care of you after your mother died (or left home)?
22. What was the highest grade in school your father completed?
23. What was the highest grade in school your mother completed?
24. What kind of work did your father do when you were a child? (If many jobs, get the one of longest duration. Be specific, e.g., sweeper in big factory.)
25. What kind of work does your father (or man of the house) do now?
26. Does your mother (or woman of the house) work outside the house? (If yes): What kind of work does she do?
27. About how much money would you say your father (or man of the house) earns a week, on the average, before taxes?
28. About how much money would you say your mother (or woman of the house) earns a week?
29. If there are any other people who bring money into the house regularly, about how much do they bring in per week?
31. Has your father been unemployed at any time during the last two months?

Home

32. Not counting the bathroom, how many rooms are there in your house?
33. How is the house heated?
34. Do you have a room all to yourself?
35. Would you say your house is very comfortable, o.k., or rather uncomfortable?

36 and 37. Does your family own the house you live in? (If yes): How much do you think the family could get if the house were sold?
(If no): How much rent do you pay?

38. Do you have your friends visit your home often, occasionally, rarely, or never?
39. Does your family own a car and a TV set?
40. About how many hard-covered books, not counting school books, are there in your house?

Family

41. How would you say the members of your family get along with each other?
42. How close would you say the members of the family are to each other?
43. Who wears the pants in the family?
44. Do you generally talk over your problems with one or both of your parents?
45. How happy do you think your parents are with each other? (If one or both are dead, or if they are separated): How happy were they?
46. Generally, how happy was your home life before you started high school?
47. How successful would you say your father (or man of the house) has been in life?
48. Is there any person in your family or among close friends of the family that you would say has been a real success in life? (If yes): Who? Why do you consider him successful? Who else?
49. When you've needed advice about planning your future, to whom have you gone?
50. If you need or should need some help in getting a start in your life would there be anyone to whom you would turn?
51. What part have your folks taken in planning your future?
52. Have your folks brought you up to feel that you're as good as anyone else?
53. When you were a child, what sort of things were you punished for?
54. When you were a child, what sort of things were you rewarded for?
55. Did your folks made any special efforts to shield you from the rough and mean things in life (Probe): What comes to mind when you hear the words "rough and mean things in life?"

School

56. What do you think is the point of going to high school?

57. If you were 14 again, and it was completely up to you, would you choose to go to high school? (Probe): Why do you feel this way?

58. Considering all of your grades in high school, did you get mostly A's, mostly B's, mostly C's or mostly D's?

58a. Do you feel that you were ever treated unfairly at school? (if yes): What happened? (Probe, if Negro youth says yes): Did this, in your opinion, have anything to do with your being a Negro?

58b. Was there any teacher in high school who took a personal interest in you? (If yes): In what way?

59. During the last year in high school, did you have any meetings about what you want to do after school with a teacher, principal, or counselor in your school? (If yes): How many meetings?

60. How interested are high school teachers in what happens to their pupils in later life?

61. Do you think you did about as well as you could at high school?

62. Do you feel that you were ever discriminated against in any way at school? (If yes): Can you tell me what happened?

63. Are you in high school at present?

Work

Those Not in School.

63a. First job, and each job thereafter:

After you left school, what was your first job?
Did anyone give you references?
How did you find out about this job?
What was your starting pay and last pay on this job?
What kind of business was your employer in?
How long were you on this job?
Why did you leave this job?

64. What have you found most satisfactory about your job experience?

65. What have you found least satisfactory about your job experience?

66. Do you feel that any of these jobs will help you in the future? (Probe, if yes or maybe): In what way?

67. (For graduates): Are you glad you stayed in high school till you graduated? Why (or why not)?
(For dropouts): Why did you leave high school before graduation?

68. (For dropouts): What would you advise a younger friend to do (about graduating)?

Those Still in School.

69. Have you held any kind of outside job since you entered high school?

70. (If any kind of work): Why did you do this work?

71. (If any kind of work): How did you get the job(s)?

72. How do you get your spending money?

CARD 2

Aspirations

4. When you were in your first year of high school, what kind of work did you want to do when you grew up?
6. Now what do you think you'd like to do?
9. (If there is a change): What made you change your mind?
10. (For girls only): Do you have any specific plans for getting married within the next few years?
11. (For girls only): Do you intend to keep on working after you are married?
12. Who has influenced you most in deciding what kind of work you want to do?
13 - 36. We'd like to know how you feel about different kinds of jobs. On your sheet you'll find a list of jobs. Tell me, for each one, whether you'd like it, whether it would be o.k., or whether you wouldn't want it.

For boys

Owner of a barber shop
Mailman
Salesman
Doctor or lawyer
Cook or valet in someone's house
Teacher
Farmer
Tool and die maker
Executive in a large office
Electrician
Accountant in an office
Policeman or fireman

For girls

Owner of a beauty shop
Clerk in a post office
Saleswoman in a big store
Doctor or lawyer
Maid in someone's house
Teacher
Welder
Writer on a national magazine
Dietician in a hospital
Telephone operator
Stenographer or secretary

37. Which type of work would you choose if you had a choice of working with people, with things, or with ideas?
37a. We'd like to know what you think makes a job a good job. Of the things listed on your sheet, which do you think is most important in making a job good? Which is next most important? Third? Fourth? Fifth? Sixth?

money
security
interesting work
pleasant fellow workers
service to humanity
public recognition

38. Which of these items on your sheet do you think is most helpful in getting ahead in life?
    1. just plain luck
    2. working hard and saving money
    3. knowing the right people and using their influence
    4. improving your education and experience

Which is next most important?

39. Suppose your wildest dreams could be realized, and absolutely nothing would stand in your way, what would you be doing ten years from now?

41. Thinking realistically, what do you think you will probably be doing ten years from now?

43. What do you think chances are that in ten years from now you will say: "The situation I'm in now isn't getting me anyplace, and I don't know where to go from here."

44. How much money do you think you (for girls: and your husband) will be making a week ten years from now, assuming the cost of living is the same as now?

45. Comparing yourself to your father (for girls: mother), do you think you will make out in life better than he, about the same, or probably not as good?

46. How decided are you about what sort of work you'd like to do?

47. Please tell me which of the statements on your sheet comes closest to describing the way you feel about going to college or for further training:

I intend to apply for entrance to college and hope to go if I am admitted.

I intend to apply for entrance to college, but am not certain yet whether I will go or not.

I probably will not apply in the near future, but hope to go some other time.

As it looks now, I probably won't be going to college at all.

I intend going to a school for further training, but not to college (i.e., trade or business school).

Don't know.

48. Would you mind very much, pretty much, not very much, or not at all if you never got to college?

49 and 50. Which of the statements on your sheet is the most important, and which is the next most important, reason for going to college?

to get a good general education
to train for a career
the social life at college
the contacts you make there
because one's friends are going
because one's family wants one to go
there's no really good reason for going to college

Elmira

51. Do you think Elmira is a good place to live?

52. How do you feel about staying in Elmira for the rest of your life? What makes you say this? (Probe Negro respondents):

(Those not willing to stay)

If you weren't a Negro, would you like to stay?

Where do you think you'd like to go and what would you do there?

(Those content to stay)

Is it better for Negroes here than other places?

52a. Do you know anybody personally that you'd very much like to be like? (If yes): Who is it and what is it about him that you admire?

52b. Is there anyone that you've heard about that you'd very much like to be like? Who? Why?

53. How do people in general seem to feel about you?

Data also included: IQ results, academic standing, type of high school course and regents or local program.

APPENDIX C
QUESTIONS USED FOR CHAPTER VI: "MANAGEMENT AND MINORITY GROUPS"

The following eight questions represent the basic areas of inquiry for the first phase of this study. The interviewers, however, were not limited to these questions and probed further within the particular interviewing situation in order to obtain full and detailed responses in these areas.

1. What are your personal feelings about Negroes and Puerto Ricans?
2. How are they "different"?
3. How do employees feel about them on the job?
4. How far up on the job scale in your plant could a Negro or Puerto Rican realistically go?
5. Why don't Negroes and Puerto Ricans get upgraded?
6. What vocational advice would you give a Negro or Puerto Rican student if you were a guidance counselor in a high school?
7. Would you hire a Negro secretary?
8. What would you advise other plants to do to achieve integration?

In the questionnaire for Phase II only six questions were scheduled and extensive probing was not specified. The interviews were personally administered. Questions 2, 3, 6, 7, and 8 above were used as well as the following: Is there any kind of work for which Negroes and Puerto Ricans are especially well-suited? Explain.

APPENDIX D
A CLASSIFICATION OF DISCRIMINATORY EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

Several writers have compiled lists of specific discriminatory employment practices. However, the list of such practices presented below is believed to be more complete and systematic than any other so far published. It classifies these practices by type of discrimination, coverage, methods used, and social groups involved. The value of such a list is that it translates general attitudes into concrete patterns of behavior and thus suggests specific possibilities of remedial action.

It should be emphasized that the practices listed below are not imputed to any particular business, labor, or other social groups in the State of New York. It should also be pointed out that nonwhites are used in this list as the symbol (since they are also the majority) of all victims of discrimination. The extent of these discriminatory practices cannot be ascertained without further detailed investigation. All that is conveyed here is an over-all view of the ways in which discrimination in employment has been and may be practiced.

TYPES AND METHODS OF DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT

I. By Individual Employers and Corporations

A. Type of discrimination:	B. Methods of discrimination:
1. Complete exclusion from employment, regardless of qualifications and previous experience.	1. Outright refusal to hire.
	2. Recruiting workers through associations and agencies with membership limited to whites.
	3. Informal instructions to supervisors and foremen.
	4. Use of employment agency as subterfuge.
	5. Devious evasion of anti-discrimination law (e.g., setting up special physical or mental qualifications for employment).
2. Partial restrictions on employment opportunities.	1. Limitation of employment to menial and unskilled jobs.
	2. Classification of jobs so as to exclude nonwhites from specific occupations and jobs.

	3. Demotion from mechanical to menial jobs.
	4. Assignment to less desirable shifts.
	5. Denial of opportunities for in-service training.
	6. Disregard of seniority rules in hiring and firing (first to be fired -- last to be re-hired), especially during periods of slack business.
	7. Disregard of seniority rules in upgrading and promotion. "Super-seniority" for white workers.
	8. Refusal to consider nonwhites for supervisory positions.
3. Unequal treatment with regard to wages and other conditions of work.	1. Disregard of rule regarding " equal pay for equal work."
	2. Segregation in plant of non-white from white workers.
	3. Failure to provide equal facilities in the way of rest rooms and other comforts.
	4. More rigid enforcement of disciplinary rules (e.g., in imposition of fines for tardiness, absenteeism, etc.).

II. By Labor and Professional Organizations

A. Type of discrimination:	B. Methods of discrimination:
1. Complete exclusion from organization and its benefits.	1. Formal restriction of membership to whites through Caucasian clause, ritual, and other devices.
	2. Informal exclusion of nonwhites by "tacit consent" of white members.
	3. Exclusion by "union-management collusion."

2. Partial restriction of membership and employment.	1. Giving nonwhites only auxiliary status in organization.
	2. Maintenance of separate hiring halls for nonwhites.
	3. Setting up all-nonwhite locals with employment jurisdiction in specified areas or plants.
	4. Informal practice of assigning nonwhites to specific jobs only and of limiting them to lower occupational status, e.g., that of helpers.
	5. Preferential placement of white workers.
	6. Informal practice of not referring nonwhites to jobs as long as white workers are available.
	7. Informal practice of blocking upgrading of nonwhite workers.
	8. Restricting access to skilled occupations through control of state licensing boards.
	9. Barring nonwhites from apprenticeship.
	10. Refusal to open to nonwhites new jobs created by technological change.
3. Unequal treatment on the job.	1. Refusal of white workers to work with nonwhites on the same job or in proximity.
	2. Creating a sense of job insecurity among nonwhite workers through social pressure and unfriendly behavior.

III. By other Social Groups and the General Public

A. Type of discrimination:	B. Methods of discrimination:
1. Pressures for complete exclusion from employment opportunities.	1. Opposition to immigration of nonwhites.
	2. Discouragement of housing provisions for nonwhites in industrial areas.
	3. Refusal to serve nonwhites in stores, hotels, restaurants, etc.
2. Pressures for restriction of employment opportunities.	1. Discouragement by community authorities of industrial plants employing nonwhite workers.
	2. Inadequate community services for nonwhites.
	3. Inadequate educational facilities for nonwhites.
	4. Informal discouraging of vocational training by school authorities and teachers.
	5. Failure to provide job counseling services.
	6. Restriction of employment in city hospitals.
	7. Limitation of admission of nonwhites to public and private nursing training schools.
	8. Nonrecognition of trade licenses issued by other states.
3. General attitudes affecting employment.	1. Tolerance or encouragement in public life of stereotypes with regard to racial and ethnic groups.
	2. Nonparticipation in efforts to reduce racial and ethnic friction in community life through parent-teachers' associations, citizens' councils, and other organizations.

APPENDIX E
SUGGESTED AREAS AND TOPICS FOR ADDITIONAL RESEARCH ON DISCRIMINATION AND LOW INCOMES

The scope of this report had to be limited for reasons indicated in Chapter I. However, in preparing for this initial study, it was thought advisable to formulate a list of questions which would indicate the areas and topics of investigation for which answers should eventually be sought. The questions are presented below in the hope that they may stimulate further research by interested individuals as well as by private and official organizations.*

1. The Social and Economic Condition of Disadvantaged Minority Groups in New York State

What is the size of different minority groups in New York State by area?

How many and what proportions of different minority groups are self-employed, in the professions, skilled, unskilled, in the various educational categories, in the various income categories, unemployed, on relief?

How many and what proportions of different minority groups are in the various industries, by area, and by comparison to the total local population?

What is the turnover of members of disadvantaged minority groups in different industries, by area, and by kind of job?

To what extent are members of the impoverished group members of groups against which discriminatory practices are employed?

What are typical career patterns of minority group members, by education, sex, age, training?

To what extent do members of minority groups belong to unions? Which industries, areas, kinds of jobs, income levels?

To what extent are members of groups against which discrimination takes place socially disorganized: proportions of divorced, separated, deserted, living together unmarried, illegitimacy, crime, delinquency, mental illness?

To what extent do members of disadvantaged minority groups participate in community organizations; integrated, segregated?

---

* The list was prepared by Drs. Clarence and Sylvia Sherwood whose contribution is gratefully acknowledged.

What are the vital statistics pertaining to the various disadvantaged minority groups: death rate; birth rate; age-specific migration rate; age-specific emigration rate; proportions married, single, by age and sex; age distribution, by sex?

In areas in which there is a heavy concentration of a disadvantaged minority group, what are the comparative figures for social and educational services: fire protection, police protection, collection of garbage, pay scale of teachers, proportion of substitute teachers to regular staff, experience of teachers, number of children per class, special training teachers, special classes for nonreaders, special classes for foreign language speaking children, value of school property per pupil, amount spent per pupil, libraries, parks, playgrounds, indoor recreation facilities, street lighting?

Do minorities frequently fail to get their fair share because of their poorer economic situation, which is brought about by other forms of discrimination; for example: failure to get unemployment insurance because they are denied employment in covered industries; failure to get unemployment insurance because their work is so irregular that they fail to qualify; old-age insurance for same reasons; residential mobility; and relief problems?

What are the rates of home ownership and income producing property ownership for the various disadvantaged minority groups? Total value, and proportion of total value?

What are the proportions of credit extended by banks to various disadvantaged groups? By other credit-extending organizations and facilities?

To what extent are minority group members tending to get firmer grips on particular job areas; holding same jobs longer; achieving advancement? What are the strengths and weaknesses in the job picture for the various disadvantaged minority groups?

2. Economic and Manpower Conditions and Potential in New York State

What is the industry picture in New York State; kinds, number, and size of industries; their competitive status in the over-all situation; which are the declining and which the expanding industries; what are the dispersal and concentration trends, geographic and economic, by industry and area; what are the seasonal variations, by industry and area; what are the automation trends, by industry and area; new industries; small business; business failure rates, by industry and area; what degrees of skill are required, by industry and area; wage rates, by industry and area?

What are the differential rates of natural increase for different minority groups; birth and death rates, by area; migration and emigration data; in predictions of population growth and changes in composition for New York State particularly with respect to labor potential; age and education distributions and trends as they relate to economic potential?

What is the ratio of labor population to estimated employment opportunities for the total population and for the various disadvantaged minority groups, by industry, area and job?

What is the relation between the number of people in an area, their characteristic occupations, and the level of living? For the various minority groups?

To what extent are selective factors operating in migration; are the families and individuals moving in ones who are most or least likely to make a success in their new location; how are these movements affecting community life?

What are the fluctuations, composition, and minority group participation in the casual labor force (snow removal, etc.)?

What is the relationship between expanding and declining markets for given industries and wage levels and employment opportunities for minority groups?

What is the relationship between the proportion of employable non-minority group women in the community and employment opportunities for minority groups?

What is the relationship between the average age of the working force and employment opportunities for minority groups; by industry, area, and job?

What are the general trends in patterns of educational requirements and their implications for employment opportunities for minority groups; by industry, area, and job?

What is the role of the minimum wage in the picture of job opportunities for minority group members?

What is the geographic mobility of the labor force and its implications for employment opportunities for minority groups?

What is the range of collective bargaining organization -- local, regional, national -- and how is this related to labor force mobility and the geographic range of job opportunities; what are its implications for employment opportunities for minority groups?

What are the school enrollment and dropout trends for different minority groups; by area?

What are the effects of social security provisions on labor mobility?

What is the influence of migration on employment opportunities and occupational adjustments?

What are the school needs in relationship to population and economic trends in the state?

To what extent are individuals from impoverished groups willing to relocate where job opportunities may be greater; what are the social and psychological obstacles to relocation?

What skills are in increasing demand which can be taught with reasonable ease?

What is the impact of automation on job opportunities for minority group members in unskilled categories?

What is the general demand for labor, by industry, area, skill required, seasonality, available housing; and implications for employment opportunities for minority group members?

3. Discrimination and the Development of Individual Potential

To what extent does poverty affect the school dropout rate for different minority groups?

For minority group members how does the career pattern of the parent affect the development of potential of offspring?

To what extent are the schools meeting the special needs of the various minority groups?

To what extent are schools acting on preconceived notions of conditions of prejudice and discrimination in industry, thereby directing certain groups away from preparation of skills for certain industries and jobs?

To what extent does acceptance or rejection on the part of the dominant group of minority group workers in a firm affect the work performance of the minority group members; their chances for advancement; absenteeism; turnover?

To what extent are minority group members operating under a "defeatist" conception of the job situation?

To what extent do members of various minority groups wish to assimilate with the dominant group?

To what extent do different minority group parents contribute to low self-images in their children; what is the impact of this on work goals, efforts, learning?

What are the variations in attitude toward work implanted in their children by minority group parents?

To what extent do different minority group parents contribute to a lack of motivation for occupational success on the part of their children?

To what extent does hostility lead to ingroup membership insistence on belonging to only those social groups composed of its own members? How is this related to lack of communication between groups, the sharing of social values, the reinforcement of discriminatory attitudes and patterns, and the life chances of members of disadvantaged minority groups?

To what extent do minority group parents urge their children to drop out of school?

To what extent do minority group parents force their children out of vocational competition with children of the dominant group?

Does learning seem to be more effective for children of given minority groups when the teachers are of the same group? Do attitudes toward school seem to be better?

When members of a disadvantaged minority are dispersed in small numbers in a school, as compared with schools in which there is a heavy concentration of such members: do scholastic achievements of such members tend to be higher or lower; do attitudes toward such members tend to be different; do self-attitudes of such individuals tend to be higher or lower; do attitudes toward school, work, and working with members of the dominant groups seem to be better or poorer?

In areas where there is public interracial housing are educational facilities of disadvantaged minorities better or poorer? Are their educational achievements greater or less?

What have been the effects on the educational progress of minority group members in areas where there have been deliberate attempts to integrate and relieve intergroup tensions?

How do teachers regard being assigned to teach in schools heavily concentrated with disadvantaged minorities; how does this affect the quality of teaching? Are there variations by degree of urbanization, geographic locality, or socio-economic level of the neighborhood served?

To what extent does a low evaluation of himself determine whether an individual of a given minority group will apply for a particular job?

4. Discrimination Mechanisms

What are the specific discriminatory mechanisms which operate in the various industries to make different minority groups competitively unequal? What are the variations by industry, by area, by recruitment method, and by group involved?

What are the recruitment methods -- how are the jobs actually filled? What are the variations by industry, by area, by skill level, by group involved?

To what extent are discriminatory policies in industry based on prejudice; on economic considerations, on pressures from workers, union, customers? What are the variations by industry, area, job level, and by group involved?

To what extent are discriminatory policies in industry the result of negative experiences with integration; of fears; of untested assumptions?

To what extent are discriminatory policies and practices in industry the result of pressures from the community? What are the variations by size of community, relative size of the firm, composition of the local population, general economic condition of the industry involved?

Where are the crucial discrimination points in the organizational hierarchy of given firms -- top level, personnel department, foremen, etc.; are there variations by industry, area, type of job, economic, and population factors?

What is the relationship between prejudicial attitudes and pressures toward excluding members of a given disadvantaged minority group from employment or from migrating to the community and estimation of these minority group members as economic competitors?

What are the criteria of worker selection (experience, skill, looks, personality, handling of people, etc.) and their impact on job opportunities for minority group members? What are the variations by industry, area, job?

What is the impact of seniority and tenure systems on employment opportunities for minority group members?

What is the impact of the notion of "responsibility" (stereotypes about irresponsibility, fear of responsibility, etc.) on employment and promotion opportunities for minority group members?

What are the implications of the "authority" factor in organizational hierarchies for promotions and employment opportunities at certain job-levels for minority group members?

What are the various control forces in the self-employment pattern, such as licensing, loans, etc.; what are their implications for minority group business opportunities?

5. Problems in Reducing or Eliminating Discrimination

What are the implications of the questions under each of the above four headings in terms of the regulatory and educational powers of SCAD?

What have been the problems faced by industries or firms which have employed members of disadvantaged minority groups? How were these problems handled? What lessons do these experiences suggest? Are there variations by industry, area, and type of work? Do the implications vary depending upon the minority group involved?

What are the particular problems of the pioneer worker-member of a minority group in a given firm? Are there variations by industry, area, and type of work; by particular minority group involved?

To what extent and how are the problems different when the community perceives the company as expanding? As contracting? When it is a one-industry town?

To what extent have unions pressed for minority group equality in employment? How have they implemented this where it has occurred? What are the variations by industry, by union, by area, by type of work?

What overt attempts have been made to promote intergroup integration in industry? By whom? What methods were used? How successful were they? What are their implications for other industries, areas, types of work?

What types of educational or other techniques are most effective in getting industries to maximize chances for equal employment opportunities for minority group members?

APPENDIX F

PARTICIPANTS IN THE ADVISORY CONFERENCE, MARCH 9, 1957

1. WARREN BANNER - National Urban League
2. SOLOMON BARKIN - Textile Workers Union
3. THEODORE BIENENSTOCK - New York State Education Department
4. HERMAN BLOCH - University of Bridgeport
5. ROBERT BOWER - Bureau of Social Science Research, Washington, D.C.
6. ARVID BRODERSEN - New School for Social Research
7. WILBUR J. COHEN - University of Michigan
8. HENRY COHEN - New York City Administrator's Office
9. H. DAVID DAVIS - Bureau of Social Science Research, Washington, D.C.
10. DAN W. DODSON - New York University Center for Human Relations
11. HORTENSE GABEL - Temporary State Housing Rent Commission
12. JOSEPH GITTLER - University of Rochester, Group Relations Study Center
13. ELI GINZBURG - Columbia University
14. DON HAGER - American Jewish Congress
15. JOHN HOPE II - Fisk University
16. FRANK HORNE - New York City Commission on Intergroup Relations
17. ABRAHAM JAFFE - Columbia University
18. ROBERT B. JOHNSON - National Conference of Christians and Jews
19. THERON JOHNSON - New York State Education Department
20. LEWIS W. JONES - Tuskegee Institute
21. ALFRED MC.LEE - Brooklyn College
22. JOSEPH MONSERRAT - Commonwealth of Puerto Rico
23. CORIENNE MORROW - New York City Commission on Intergroup Relations
24. RICHARD PLAUT - National Scholarship Service and Fund for Negro Students
25. DONALD ROSS - New York State Education Department
26. MORTON J. SCHUSSHEIM - Temporary State Housing Rent Commission
27. BERT SEIDMAN - AFL-CIO
28. CLARENCE SENIOR - Commonwealth of Puerto Rico
29. HANS SIMONS - New School for Social Research
30. MARSHALL SKLARE - American Jewish Committee
31. STERLING SPERO - New York University
32. HANS STAUDINGER - New School for Social Research
33. HENRY STETLER - Connecticut Commission on Civil Rights
34. ROBERT WEAVER - Temporary State Housing Rent Commission
35. MAX WOLFF - New School for Social Research
36. ADAM YARMOLINSKY - Fund for the Republic
37. CHARLES ZIMMERMAN - International Ladies Garment Workers Union

Projects of the New York State Interdepartmental Committee on Low Incomes

Incomes, Work Experience and Economic Status of Families and Individuals in New York State, 1956-1957-- a statewide household survey conducted by the U. S. Bureau of the Census as an extension of its National Current Population Survey. The survey provides current information for total New York State population on incomes, economic activity, labor force participation, education, housing and other selected factors associated with economic status. Similar data on ethnic groups in New York City has been obtained.

Size and Characteristics of the New York State Low Income Population, 1949-1956 -- an analysis of the data of the special 1956-1957 survey and the 1949 Census to determine characteristics of families and individuals with low incomes and trends in incomes and economic status between these two years.

Public Assistance Recipients in New York State, January-February 1957 -- a study conducted with the cooperation of the New York State Department of Social Welfare and local public welfare agencies. Detailed information on demographic, personal and economic characteristics of recipients of public assistance and their families and other relatives living in the household was obtained from existing case records supplemented by personal interview.

Low Incomes in Rural New York State -- a study by the New York State College of Agriculture, Cornell University, analyzing the causes of low incomes and substandard levels of living in rural areas and proposing lines of remedial action.

Discrimination and Low Incomes -- studies conducted by the New School for Social Research under contract with the New York State Commission Against Discrimination, to explore the disproportionate concentration of minority groups in the low income population and to investigate ways in which discrimination leads to this concentration.

Incomes, Expenditures and Family Adjustments to Unemployment-- household surveys of families of unemployment insurance beneficiaries conducted in cooperation with the Committee by the Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University, under contract with the Division of Employment, New York State Department of Labor, in Albany-Schenectady-Troy and in the Utica area. Interviews are conducted with a sample of individuals and families of persons currently receiving unemployment insurance benefits to obtain detailed information on incomes and expenditures before and after unemployment, and on financial adjustments and other effects of unemployment on family living.

Demonstration Program for Improving the Economic Status of Low Income Families-- a pilot local-state action program under the auspices of a widely representative Community Development Committee of Oneida County, supported by the Interdepartmental Committee and the cooperating State agencies to demonstrate that State programs and available community resources and services, both public and voluntary, can be applied in a coordinated effort to enable individuals and families to achieve improved self-sufficiency and higher levels of productivity and earnings, enhanced social usefulness and economic well-being.